

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of residents of Omaha, Nebr., asking that lemons be placed on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of Herbert F. Hagadorn and others, of Carthage, N. Y., and Martin Nolan and others, of Hainsville, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Resolution of Carpenters' District Council, Providence, R. I., to repeal the 10-cent tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SABATH: Resolution of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, favoring the placing on the free list of all bagging and ties used in the baling of cotton; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club, Buffalo, N. Y., favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Irish-American and German-American societies of New York, which have also been indorsed by their respective divisions in Kansas City, Mo., protesting against a new arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of board of directors of the produce exchange of Los Angeles, and the members thereof, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 7649, whereby the time of carrying butter, eggs, and poultry in cold storage is to be limited to 90 days; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Spratts Patent, America (Ltd.), of Newark, N. J., protesting against putting dog cakes and other foods for domestic animals on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of George C. Edwards, Bridgeport, Conn., favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Tioga County Pomona Grange, No. 30; Bert Tuttle and others, of Austenburg; Tioga Valley Grange, No. 918, of Mansfield; and Lookout Grange, No. 1426, Keating Summit, all in the State of Pennsylvania, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. G. Graham and others, of Jersey Shore, Pa., and Charles Anderson and others, of Sheffield, Pa., requesting the withdrawal of troops from Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, April 21, 1911.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, fountain of wisdom, source of all good, keep us, we beseech Thee, in touch with Thee through the remaining hours of this day that we enter not into temptation, that we do wrong to no man, but with high resolves and noble purposes we may go forward with the work Thou hast given us to do. In the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. HILL was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Kate Malloi, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House the papers in the case of Jake H. Wackert, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. SWITZER was granted leave of absence for 10 days, on account of important business.

### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

By unanimous consent, the Committee on War Claims was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6096) relating to claims arising under the provisions of the captured and abandoned property act, and for other purposes, and to amend and revise the same, and the same was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### CANADIAN RECIPROCITY BILL.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4412, a bill to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4412, the Canadian reciprocity bill, with Mr. SHERLEY in the chair.

Mr. MCCAILL. Mr. Chairman, in arising to close the debate in behalf of those Members upon this side of the House who believe in the policy of the present bill, I desire to say that I think the House is to be congratulated upon the illuminating discussion to which it has had an opportunity to listen. The speeches delivered upon both sides of the question and upon both sides of the aisle have been worthy of the subject—a subject which, as was said by the gentleman from Illinois yesterday, is one of the most important ever before the American Congress. The bill has important international aspects and features of an economic character that call for the careful consideration of every Member. It does not make an appeal for the use of the heroics of the hustings, but for the best thought each one of us is capable of giving it.

I listened with great interest to the speech of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HIXON]—the first speech that he has had an opportunity to deliver in this House, of which he has been almost the directing agency for nearly 20 years. It was a speech beautiful in structure, such a speech as is made out of a full mind, and it was entirely worthy of the subject which he discussed. I say that, although I profoundly disbelieve in the conclusions which he maintained. I regretted to notice, however, the pessimistic tone that the gentleman adopted with reference to the American farmer. But it is not strange that, having been in a position where for 20 years he could not escape from listening to the debates, he should have caught the minor key in which the praises of the farmer are usually sung upon this floor. [Applause.]

According to his eulogists here, the American farmer is a very serious-minded individual, with his wife and numerous progeny gathered about him—and I observe that these eulogists usually bless him with a bountiful offspring—desperately and with great solemnity endeavoring to cling to a precarious existence. These orators lament over his rugged qualities, they almost brood over his virtues, and as for his faults, he has none, for he is a being to whom it is impossible to sin.

Mr. Chairman, I have had some experience with the American farmer. I have seen him in his native lair. It was my great good fortune to live for a number of years in my boyhood upon one of those glorious farms in northwestern Illinois—a \$200-an-acre farm, as the gentleman from Indiana called it—one of those prairie farms, not the flat farms that you have farther to the west, but where you have the billows of the prairie tumbling about you. One of those farms which, when they are under cultivation, present a scene of pastoral beauty and of fertility such as can scarcely be found anywhere in the world. I have seen farmers actually burn corn for fuel, as has been so dramatically stated in this debate. Why, it has been presented here, as if it showed the destitution of the American farmer and his straitened circumstances, that he actually burned corn for fuel. I have seen him burn corn. Sometimes he would overcrop with one grain and could not sell it profitably, but he was pretty sure to get even on some other grain; and instead of brooding over the burning of corn, more probably the farmer would sit cheerily smoking his pipe in the light of its blazing fire and his sons would rejoice that they did not have to chop wood. [Laughter and applause.]

The American farmer is not the sad-eyed monstrosity, always staring destiny in the face, that we have had painted here. The farmers, as I knew them, were a prosperous, independent, and happy race of men. I have known many farmers, and I have known some men even on Wall Street, and I have made up my mind that they both belong to the same race, and that there is about as much human nature in the one class as in the other. I have sometimes thought that if the numbers were reversed and that if we had 5,000,000 voters on Wall Street and only a few hundred farmers, our statesmen would sing the homely virtues of J. P. Morgan and his crew and would bestow upon them some of these lugubrious eulogiums of which the American farmer has been so long the patient victim. [Applause and laughter.] And their worst enemy could hardly wish them a harder fate.

Now, it is argued against this bill—and I do not propose to weary the House with a repetition of the statistics we have heard—that just as the opening up of the Western States depressed agriculture in New England so the opening up of our markets to Canadian produce will have the same effect upon the agriculture of the country, and especially upon the agriculture of the West. There is no similarity whatever between the two cases. From 1870 to 1890, you will remember, we built railroads simply for the sake of building railroads. We threw, sometimes in a single year, many thousands of miles of railroad across the most fertile land on the face of the globe, land that was uninhabited. Railroads went in advance of civilization, and in order to get business they sent their agents all over Europe stimulating immigration; and it so happened that the financial and commercial depression from 1873 to 1878 threw hundreds of thousands of men out of employment in the East, and they found places upon the western farms. We had brought under cultivation, and their produce thrown upon our markets almost, as it were, in a day, great and fertile States of this Union, and in order to permit the farmers to live the railroads gave them unnaturally low rates to the markets of the country and to those abroad.

It was said by Prof. Meyer that a bushel of wheat could be carried more cheaply from Chicago to Liverpool than from Budapest to Prague, a distance in a straight line of only 175 miles. A man in Illinois could get into the markets of Boston more cheaply than a man who lived in Worcester County in Massachusetts. The result of this abnormally low rate was practically to transport the prairies of the West into the suburbs of New York and Boston. And, of course, agriculture was depressed in New England, not merely from that circumstance, but because of the conditions there which were adverse to agriculture as it was then conducted.

I saw agriculture not only in the West, but when I was a young boy my father sent me to New England to school, and I had an opportunity there to see how they farmed in New England. In the West a farmer could turn a furrow for a mile, if his farm went that far, without taking his hand from the plow; but in New England the farmer would urge his horses, and more often his oxen, for a few feet and then would have to turn out for a stump or stone. [Laughter.] He would try to select smooth little patches upon the hillside. While a New England hillside, with its alternation of little rye fields and cornfields and pasture and meadow and woodland, presents a very beautiful mosaic to the eye, it certainly is not favorable to agriculture. [Laughter.] And it was inevitable that under the adverse natural conditions and with the antiquated methods which the New England farmers employed they could not compete with the rich and fertile prairie lands of the West.

Now, how is it with Canada? Why, there is, as I have said, no parallel between the two cases. Champlain laid the foundations of Port Royal and Quebec before the Pilgrims landed upon Plymouth Rock. That country is as old as this country.

For 150 years it has been a part of the wealthiest empire in the world, and yet to-day it has less than 8,000,000 people, and instead of capitalists putting in their money, thrusting railroads across the cold fields of Canada, Canada has been compelled largely to build her railroads out of her own treasury, and although she has given enormous land grants and vast sums of money she to-day has only about 25,000 miles of railroads in the whole Dominion.

Canada has not the slightest advantage over the West in fertility or in aptitude for agriculture. The advantage is all the other way. The part of Canada gentlemen fear is a country of a single crop. A single crop will sack the soil. The farms in the Canadian northwest are scarcely habitable for a good many months in the year. Agriculture in our West can be carried on under far better conditions than there.

The lands there are not so cheap as they were in the West when it was settled. Rich prairie land sold in the United States for \$5 and less an acre. I happen to know a case where a very intelligent business man of New England desired to buy a half section of unbroken land for each of his two sons. He bought it nearly two years ago, selecting it with great judgment and care, and he was compelled to pay the Canadian Pacific Railroad Co. \$25 an acre, and another young man bought some land two weeks afterwards and it had risen to \$30 an acre; and that prairie land has since been going up in price. These young gentlemen who started out to build their fortunes found that they had to pay a very high price for their horses, had to hire a man to look after their farms in the winter, began with a drought and a poor crop, and at the present time they still have their fortunes to acquire.

But suppose our young men do go to Canada, and many of them have already gone there. Why, the State of Iowa, that

wonderful agricultural State, during the last decade lost in population. Does that mean that it declined in prosperity? Not at all. It is one of the greatest, and is destined to continue to be one of the greatest, and richest agricultural regions in the world. But young men have gone from Iowa because they could get more land in Canada than at home. The land of their own State was all taken up. Suppose they shall found upon the eastern slopes of the Canadian Rockies a newer and a fairer Iowa? Who is there who will not wish them Godspeed? [Applause.] They go there to win their fortunes, just as their fathers made their fortunes, by selling in the open markets of the world; and if they deserve to prosper and if the country is so favorable to agriculture, they will repeat the prosperity of their fathers.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. Hinds], in the course of his speech, alluded to the agricultural conditions in Germany, and to the fact that Bismarck established agricultural duties there. I fancy that Bismarck did not establish agricultural duties so much for the sake of agriculture as to placate the powerful agrarian element and establish generally in Germany the policy of protection. But they have had, ever since the time of Bismarck, high protection upon agricultural products in Germany.

Let us see what the effect has been. There is this singular law, pointed out by Prof. Fawcett, of Cambridge University, England, that while in a great many articles of common use the demand does not increase the price, yet in the case of agricultural products the demand does increase the price, and he reached that conclusion upon a line of argument something like this:

A man may be producing manufactures of cotton or flax or some other article in which labor is the chief element of production, and if there is a demand for twice as many goods of the kind he makes, he doubles the size of his factory and can manufacture even more cheaply than he could before. But in a country like Germany, which normally supports its population, when you come to increase that population under the stimulus of protection, by building up great manufacturing cities and making a strain upon the resources of the soil, there is a greater demand for agricultural produce than the farmer normally has raised. Now, there are in every country some lands that ordinarily are not cultivated because prices do not make it profitable to cultivate them. They are called valueless, but when you raise the price of farm products it pays to till the best of these lands, and the higher the price the poorer the land it will pay to cultivate. There is an "oscillating margin," upon which you may or may not be able profitably to raise farm produce, according as farm produce is high or low. The man who cultivates must get prices that will warrant him in doing so. These prices enable the man who has fertile land to make still more money, and the increased demand for agricultural produce drives people into the cultivation of lands previously unprofitable, and in order to induce them to do it they must of necessity be paid a higher price for their produce.

Now, let us see what has happened in Germany, which relatively to us has a very large population per square mile and which, with a growing population, has had high protection in agriculture for a great many years. The growing demand for foodstuffs has greatly increased prices. I noticed the other day an address made by the chancellor of the German Empire, who is a rigid and uncompromising protectionist. At a meeting of the National Society of Agriculture he said:

I am especially grateful to the president—  
That is, the president of that society—

for his frank admission that the prices of many farm products have in the past year reached an unhealthy height, burdening in a deplorable manner a great number of people.

That comes from the chancellor of the German Empire with reference to this artificial increase in the price of food. He declares that it burdens in a deplorable manner a great number of people.

Let us look further at the situation in Germany. The agrarian element there, who own the land, are a very powerful element. They not only enjoy high and unnatural prices for the common articles of food, but they have great power in directing the German Empire. As you all know, the State owns the railroads. At a certain time of the year the sugar-bearing lands along the Elbe make special demands for agricultural labor, and so it used to be the custom at that time of the year for laborers living along the Oder to go and help in the harvest of these sugar-bearing lands, where they would get better wages, and then when the harvesting was over to come back again. The German railroads gave them excursion rates. Those agrarians who lived along the Oder made a complaint to the German Government in effect that they had a natural right to employ the labor of their locality, and that for the Government to give these laborers excursion rates made it necessary for the agri-



rians to pay higher wages to their men; and although the minister of finance admitted that it was a good thing for the German laborer, although it gave him more money temporarily, although it enabled an untraveled class to get away from home and to see another part of the Empire and have their outlook broadened, yet the Government yielded to the demand of the agrarian element and refused longer to sell the excursion tickets.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS] alluded to the law called the Gregory King law, by which he showed that as the supply of an article of common use increased at an arithmetical ratio, the price decreased at practically a geometrical ratio.

That is, you increase the surplus of a necessary article and you depress the price out of all proportion to the amount by which you increase the surplus. It readily occurred to me that there is a reverse to that law, and the other side is illustrated in the case of Germany. If you decrease below the natural demand the supply of an article of common use in an arithmetical ratio, you increase the price of that article in practically a geometrical ratio. [Applause.] I think there is no escape from that conclusion.

Then about the static equilibrium of which he spoke, in nations between agriculture and manufactures. It is a very good thing if you can secure the equilibrium naturally, but it is a very bad thing to pay too much for it. Suppose there is a nation that has coal mines, iron mines, water powers, great facilities for manufacturing, and a poor soil. Is it wise for her to take her people from the operation of the great natural resources and facilities for manufacturing with which she has been blessed and put them to the cultivation of an infertile soil? Is it not better for them to work the mines, to build up manufactures, and exchange their products with some other nation that does not have these resources but has a fertile soil?

Carry it out to extremes on this theory and every household should maintain an equilibrium, and each should have its own blacksmith, its own shoemaker, and its own spinner. The law of modern trade is for men and nations to do the things they are best fitted to do and to exchange products with each other. [Applause.]

I paid close attention to the argument of the gentleman from Maine, because I have a high respect for him and because I was greatly attracted by his speech. There is one other thing to which I wish to call attention. He referred to the British tariff commission, and quoted them as in favor, practically, of reenacting the corn laws. That would strike an ordinary man as an admission almost from the Cobden Club itself in favor of the policy which the gentleman from Maine was advocating. I thought from its name, as very likely the gentleman from Maine thought, that it must be a royal commission, or if not a royal commission it must be a sort of Government commission. I have looked it up, and in Hazell's Annual, which tells you briefly everything about the Empire, you will find the British Tariff Commission tabulated with other similar organizations. On the one side it frankly states the organizations against Mr. Chamberlain's proposal, which was to tax food coming into England, and there we have the Free Trade League and the Cobden Club and others. In the other column they have catalogued the organizations for Mr. Chamberlain's proposal, and among them is the tariff commission, established by Joseph Chamberlain in the beginning of 1904 in order to push along his particular ideas. That is practically the protective-tariff league of the British Empire, and if you read the names you will find there a collection of gentlemen, some of them very comfortable manufacturers, who are deeply concerned, as are the manufacturers in this country, for the poor farmer. [Laughter and applause.]

I could construct a tariff commission like that here, and it would be a commission of more eminent ability. I would put the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], my distinguished, and I may say my illustrious, friend at the head; I would put the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] upon it; I would give a place upon it to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]; and then I would add to it the secretary of the American Protective Tariff League and of the Home Market Club of Massachusetts. And we should have a fine collection of gentlemen, of great ability and great knowledge; but if I wanted to hold forth anything they said in favor of protection as an admission of an ancient enemy to protection I think some of our narrow-minded partisans on the other side would reserve the right to object. [Laughter and applause.]

This whole discussion has revolved about the price of wheat. But first I wish to say a word about the price of land. I do not think the effect of this legislation is going to be to decrease the price of land, but to keep it from going up too rapidly in value. So far as competition with Canada is concerned, if North Dakota, which has a longer summer and a shorter winter

than Canada, can be a part of the same agricultural domain and can compete with Kansas and Iowa and Oklahoma and those wonderfully rich lands toward the South, lands as fertile as those in Campania, where, as Virgil said—

Summer borrows months beyond her own;  
Twice the teeming flocks are fruitful,  
Twice the laden orchards groan—

if North Dakota can compete with lands like those, what has she to fear from the more frosty Alberta? What has Minnesota to fear from Manitoba when she can prosper side by side with Iowa and Nebraska?

The debate has been chiefly about the farmer, and I have wondered whether he was really so much agitated over this bill as we have been led to believe. I have wondered, since in 1865 patriotism was the pretext which certain great interests employed to terminate the Elgin treaty, whether after all there was not something masked behind the farmer here. People have been industriously sending telegrams to Members. Evidently there has been a great campaign of education, and the suspicion that the farmer was being put where he did not deserve to be has reminded me of that old fort near Panama which was captured from the Spaniards by Morgan and his buccaneers, and it is said the way they captured it was to drive in advance of their charging columns the nuns and the sisters of charity. The Spaniards did not wish to fire upon these good women and so the buccaneers captured the fortress. [Applause and laughter.] I do not wish to say that there have been any other gentlemen behind the American farmer, but I have had just a suspicion that there were some interests behind him pushing him to the front to take the brunt of the fire or to silence it.

But this whole question revolves about wheat, and it seems to me that we can decide it upon wheat alone. I think there is no doubt that in any country which exports a considerable surplus of wheat the price is fixed in the market that takes the surplus. We have been for many years one of the great granaries of the world, selling in the open market, and our wheat has sold on a parity and is selling to-day on a parity, freights being adjusted, with the wheat of Argentina, of Australia, of Canada, of India, and Russia. Although it would seem hardly necessary to quote an authority upon so clear a proposition, I have here Prof. Dondlinger's interesting book on wheat. He has evidently written with great sympathy for the farmer, and he lays down this proposition:

As soon as a country has a surplus for export and receives more for exported wheat than the home price, plus the exporting, the export will increase, the home price will rise, production will increase, and the price is no longer fixed within the country. The country which buys the export may thus fix the price of wheat for the country which produces it. \* \* \* It is as a consumer of the world surplus that England has held a position of such commanding importance in fixing the price of wheat.

Gentlemen present here some discrepancies in the price of wheat upon one side of the line and the other. I can find similar discrepancies between neighboring towns in South Dakota. It depends upon elevator facilities, it depends upon competition in buying, and you can find those differences in towns in the same State. They are simply little backward whirls and eddies, that you will find in the most rapid onrushing stream. They are simply the exceptions that prove the rule.

The man in North Dakota does not compete with the man across the line in Manitoba directly, but he competes with him 4,000 miles away in the Liverpool market. We have an exportable surplus of something like 100,000,000 bushels a year, and Canada has an exportable surplus of, perhaps, half that amount, and those surpluses are both taken by the Liverpool market. It makes no difference whether the wheat is swept from Canadian or American thrashing floors, when it goes to Liverpool, according to its quality, one kind brings the same price as the other. And so we witness this spectacle on account of the high tariff wall; we see these two broad, golden rivers of wheat flowing in parallel lines upon either side of the boundary and seeking the level of a common market. It seems to me quite beyond our capacity to understand that any other law can operate where we export such an enormous volume of this necessary article, not controlled by a trust, than that the price is fixed in the country which takes the surplus.

Let us take the reverse of that, and we have an illustration to prove the truth of this rule. Take sugar. We do not produce as much sugar as we consume. We consume some 3,500,000 tons every year, and we need to import a great deal from the outside world. Some years ago we had before this House a proposition to give a preferential duty of 20 per cent to Cuban sugar over other sugars. It was alleged here that the Cubans, for whom we designed this arrangement, would get no benefit at all, but that it would go to the Sugar Trust, and what do we

see? We see precisely the result that the advocates of that reciprocity bill pointed out at that time.

The sugar market of the world is Hamburg. The price of sugar in New York is the Hamburg price plus the freight across the ocean plus the full duty into New York. And the Cuban planters, providing they show reasonable intelligence and do not glut the market at a given time, can reckon on the Hamburg price with the freight and full duty added. Since we have to make up our deficiency in the production of sugar by large importations, our home price is the world's—or Hamburg—price with the duty added, and there is a parity in price between Hamburg and Cuba and Sumatra when the differences in duties and freights are considered.

I read this morning in the New York Sun an article upon sugar written, I believe, by Mr. Robinson, one of the most accomplished economic writers upon the American press. He took importations from Sumatra and from some other countries and he carried out the prices into thousands, and then an importation from Cuba, which had a preferential duty. When they were finally landed in New York they all appeared at precisely the same price, each paying its freight and particular duty. That price is adjusted, although I am not quoting him as an authority upon that, with reference to the Hamburg price.

What is going to happen to wheat if this bill passes? Gentlemen say, if the effect is not to decrease the price of bread, why do we want to pass the bill, and if it is going to decrease the price of bread, it will injure the American farmer, and they repeat this very ancient tariff riddle. I will tell you what I think will happen. We are going to reach just the same condition in regard to wheat as we are in to-day in regard to sugar. When we cease to raise as much as we consume, and when we shall have to bring wheat in from other nations for our own consumption, then we shall see the law I have been talking about illustrated from the reverse side.

Instead of our exporting at the world's price to Liverpool, paying our freight, we shall buy at the world's price at Liverpool and pay in addition the freight and the cost of overcoming any other obstacles in order to get into our own market; and when you reach that point the tariff for the first time—this tariff that has looked so magnificent upon the statute books to the American farmer—will become operative to increase the price of wheat above the world's price. Now, is there any American farmer who would desire to add to the price he is getting in Liverpool 25 cents a bushel of tariff plus the freight rate from Liverpool? He has prospered on wheat growing on the basis of prices in the markets of the world. Do you imagine that when the time of our scarcity comes and when we are not raising as much as we consume that the American farmer will desire to have this price artificially raised in order that he may make more money? He certainly will make as much then if the tariff is not on as he does now.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. McCALL. Just a brief one. I am afraid I shall not have time to conclude.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. It is precisely upon this point. All I desire to know is the gentleman's conclusion from his argument. The gentleman argues the price of wheat is fixed at Liverpool, and supposing it will continue to be fixed at Liverpool I desire to know whether in the view of the gentleman the price of wheat in this country will be affected by this Canadian reciprocity agreement?

Mr. McCALL. When I say the price of wheat is fixed in Liverpool, of course that is only popularly correct. The price of wheat is fixed compared with the world's demand and the world's supply.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota rose.

Mr. McCALL. Now, just wait a minute. If the effect of this treaty or bill is to increase the world's supply of wheat, then to that extent you will keep down the world's price of wheat; but inasmuch as Canada has access to the same market it has now, it is not probable that the effect of this bill will be to increase her production of wheat. Consequently the passage of the bill will have no effect upon the world's price of wheat.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will it have any effect upon the price of wheat in the United States? I desire to have the gentleman's opinion on that.

Mr. McCALL. Now, I think I reasoned that point out. The gentleman may not have done me the honor of paying attention—

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I have paid very close attention.

Mr. McCALL. I think I have suggested that this will become operative and keep the price down at the time when we have to import a surplus, and then it will be more convenient for us to buy from Canada; and—I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. It is a very important subject, and I want the gentleman's views upon it.

Mr. McCALL. I know it is a very interesting subject, with many ramifications, but I can hardly be turned from the main course of my argument in the time which I have.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Does the gentleman decline to yield on that point for a question?

Mr. McCALL. The gentleman wants me to appear ungracious by declining to yield?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. No.

Mr. McCALL. I think I answered the gentleman's question. For that reason I would prefer not to yield.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. McCALL. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. McCALL. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman think that if ever in the fullness of time we do not produce wheat in the United States sufficient for our own consumption, the future Congresses, 40, 50, or 100 years from now, will not be competent to deal with this question? [Applause.]

Mr. McCALL. If the gentleman is here at that time [loud applause and laughter], and the universal hope is manifested in the universal applause [applause], and it appears that the farmer is getting 25 cents a bushel out of this duty on his wheat, and the proposition is made upon this floor to strike off that duty, and therefore to reduce the farmer's price, the gentleman from Illinois will seize the pillars of the temple of protection and will threaten to pull them all down if we touch the farmer's duty upon wheat. [Applause.]

A great deal has been said about the Elgin treaty. It has been argued that it was unfavorable to the United States. Let me call your attention to this circumstance, that in 1850 the trade going both ways between Canada and the United States only amounted to about \$5,000,000 a year. This treaty was put in force in 1855 and remained in force for 11 years, and yet in that time it covered nearly a half billion of trade between the two countries. Why, it practically created trade between Canada and the United States, and Canada for a generation after we abrogated that treaty stood in our antechambers asking that we make another reciprocity arrangement with her. She continued to do so for 30 years, until at last Sir Wilfrid Laurier said, "No more pilgrimages to Washington."

Sir John Macdonald made it the fundamental policy of his party to have reciprocity with the United States and, at the same time, incidental protection. And when he came into power, about 1880, for, I think, the second or third time, he established the policy of protection for Canada and attempted to secure a reciprocity treaty. That policy of protection had the effect of stimulating Canadian manufacture, and in 1893 Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the present prime minister, said that "If you give us Liberals power we will destroy protection, which is a sham and a delusion and a robbery," showing that there was complete reciprocity in political rhetoric and that he had gotten that "free of all duty" from the Democratic Party in the United States. [Laughter and applause.]

Sir Wilfrid Laurier three years afterward was intrusted with power. He is a sound and sagacious statesman, and I wish to call the attention of my enthusiastic friends upon the other side of the aisle to the fact that he has done nothing whatever to reduce protective duties in Canada except simply to create the British preferential. And I trust that his sound sense and moderation will be imitated by gentlemen upon the other side if they ever have the responsibility of dealing with the tremendous industries of the United States.

I think it is not necessary to say anything upon the most-favored-nation aspect of this treaty. We heard a great deal about it when the question was discussed in the last Congress, and the fact that that objection has not been urged by gentlemen in the present debate is pretty conclusive evidence that there was no foundation whatever for their former contention. I think, also, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOWLAND] has finally disposed of the argument, or, rather, the objection, that we should not have reciprocity in competitive articles.

I am rather surprised to find gentlemen representing border States of the Union opposed to this treaty. A high-tariff wall, however beneficial it may be to a country as a whole, throws a very deep shadow. People can only trade upon one side of the



wall. They are shut out from their neighbors upon the other side. If the men in North Dakota would look at this a little more broadly, they would see that it would be far better for their State, for the farmers there, to trade across the line and acquire farms across the line and not be upon the outer rim of the country where the circulation of the trade current is feeble, as is that of the blood in the extremities of the body. I would suggest that they should not want to continue to be the extremities of the body politic, but that they might more profitably wish to annex Canada industrially, so that they might trade and extend their farms to the north as well as to the south.

Now, it has been denied that the policy of reciprocity, such as this bill presents, is a Republican policy. We have had it shown in this debate that the administration of President Grant, who was a pretty good Republican and did not come from New England, negotiated a reciprocity treaty upon the lines of the Elgin treaty. We have seen that Garfield, afterwards President, was in favor of the Elgin treaty. We had it asserted upon the authority of Mr. Curtis that Mr. McKinley was in favor of the policy. Certainly the amendment proposed by Mr. Blaine tended strongly to show that he was in favor of the policy.

And now I want to quote from a very distinguished man, a man who was governor of a leading State and who has since succeeded a great statesman as the political leader of his State. I refer to ALBERT B. CUMMINS, who was at the time governor of Iowa. I am going to quote from a speech of Gov. CUMMINS, made to the Boston Merchants' Association on December 10, 1903. I will not read all of the extract, because it is somewhat long, but I will read what he says in conclusion:

Suppose we could to-night add Canada, from ocean to ocean and from her southern line to the North Pole, to the territory of the United States, so that when some courageous American explorer plants the banner of the Republic upon the axis of the world and its beautiful folds fill with the air of the North it will proclaim the eternal sovereignty of the United States. \* \* \* How many are there here or elsewhere who would look upon this accession of power and population upon land and lake and sea as a misfortune to our country or a blow inflicted upon her prosperity?

I go further and eliminate national pride. How many banks would fail on that account? How many factories would close because the Stars and Stripes were flying over this vast domain? What acre would be worth less? What man would be without work or receive less compensation?

Mark you, I am not dreaming of annexation, nor am I advocating free trade with Canada, for the former is more remote than ever before, and the latter is wholly impracticable. I have used the figure only to show that we can safely draw nearer to our neighbor and safely enter upon the negotiation of a reciprocal treaty.

[Applause.]

I commend that to the attention of some of our agricultural friends from the West. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, it appears from some of the arguments made in this House, and from some of the arguments that are advanced in Canada, that this bill is to be mutually destructive to the agriculture of both countries, and that the deplorable condition of the American farmer under it is only to be equaled by the wretched squalor which the Canadian farmer will have to face. [Laughter.] As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NYE] so eloquently said yesterday, this bill presents a great ethical question. It presents an enlightened policy. The President of the United States is simply asking this country to obey the laws of nature, which no great nation can violate with impunity.

Here these two countries lie side by side for over 3,700 miles. The lines of trade naturally run north and south, and we are attempting to force them to run east and west.

And it is the policy of justice. Remember that during the last dozen years our balance of trade against Canada has been nearly \$1,000,000,000. She is buying of us this very year more than \$250,000,000 in value, and 70 per cent of that trade goes there absolutely free of duty. Her average duty against the goods that we send her is only half as much as the average duty that we impose against her; and of this you may be certain, that after this bill shall pass the average duty of the United States against Canada will still be higher than the average of the duties levied by Canada against the United States.

The President is recognizing the laws of nature. The fact that that country buys from us nearly twice as much as she does from all the other nations of the world shows most powerfully how the ties of nature are drawing us commercially together. It is not wise to try to float upstream. We should permit the laws of nature to work without obstruction, and they will work, for the benefit of both countries. The size of our planet is dwindling every year. The discovery of all of the lands of the world, the wonderful inventions of the last century, the railroad and the telephone and the telegraph make this world to-day as small, compared with the world of the time of Columbus, as one of Jupiter's satellites is as compared with

Jupiter. We are rapidly growing smaller, and here is this great neighbor of ours that is industrially a part of the United States. I say it is wise for us to recognize that fact and to pass this bill. It does not go far enough, but it takes a long step in the right direction.

Mr. LONGWORTH rose.

Mr. McCALL. I have about three minutes more.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I dislike to interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. McCALL. It is simply a matter of saying a few things in three minutes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I simply want to ask the gentleman one question. He spoke during the course of his remarks on the question of the most-favored-nation clause. He said that nothing in this bill as it stands would violate the most-favored-nation clause. Suppose, however, an amendment were offered changing a duty in this bill; as, for instance, suppose that an amendment were offered putting Canadian meat on the free list without any reduction on the part of Canada. In his opinion would that violate the most-favored-nation clause?

Mr. McCALL. I think that would violate the most-favored-nation clause.

I regret that I have only three minutes more. It is argued in effect by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] in his very able speech:

Add this farmers' free list to this bill. Load it to the gunwales with amendments and sink it if you can.

Consider for a moment the sort of a measure this bill would become. Here is a proposition to carry out an international agreement. The first section of the act says that flour shall be admitted at a certain rate of duty from Canada when Canada shall admit flour at the same rate coming from this country, and the same thing with regard to meat and other articles.

The trade is carefully carried out in the first article. Then, in the fourth article, with contemptuous levity we say that all these things, coming from all the rest of the world, for which Canadian statesmen have paid a consideration to get a reduction of duty upon them, shall come into our markets free of duty. Webster said, "Politics should cease at the water's edge"; but this would be playing politics upon an international scale. It would treat with levity the negotiations between the Canadian commissioners and the President of the United States. It would attest, at the same time, their inability to make a bargain and the ability of the President of the United States to drive a hard bargain, because, without any consideration whatever, in a subsequent section, we freely give better terms to the rest of the world.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may have just two or three minutes more, the boundary line between these two countries stretches, as I have said, for 3,700 miles. There is no modern fort along that line. After the war of 1812, by the Rush-Bagot treaty, we agreed to have no further armaments upon the Great Lakes, although two of the chief battles of that war had been fought upon them. Great cities, with billions of dollars of property, with fabulous wealth, have grown up along that boundary. They are not defended by a single gun, but there are no cities in all the world that are more safe, because they are fortified and guarded by the good sense, the common interests, and the friendly sentiments of two great nations. [Applause.] We have forts, it is true, and guns along that line, but they are antiquated and the survivals of a time long past. And we have made the dreams of the poets come true, for the boys have mimic wars in the crumbling embrasures of the forts, the birds build their nests in the lips of the cannon, and little children play upon them and clasp their silent throats. We can just as safely dismantle the tariff forts between the two countries. Canada is one with us in sentiment. She is one with us in all the strongest ties that can draw nations together; and I trust that this side of the House will vie with that side of the House and support the President of the United States in the enlightened and civilized policy proposed by this bill. [Prolonged applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]. [Applause.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the gentleman who preceded me [Mr. McCALL] in believing that the question now under discussion in this House is one of vast importance. I quite agree with him also that the debate has been of a high order, quite up to the best traditions of the House of Representatives.

During the last Congress I took occasion to make some observations upon the pending measure, and I shall endeavor so far as I can to avoid any repetition now.

With such knowledge as I was able to gain at that time, of its purposes and probable effects, I felt it my duty to oppose it.

Investigation and reflection have strengthened me in the conviction that the best interests of our people call, and call loudly, for its defeat. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I shall not waste time by way of preliminaries. I ask, in the first place, what necessity was there for the making of this agreement at this time?

Our trade relations with Canada had been adjusted under a tariff law only recently passed. The President had announced that they had been satisfactorily adjusted. The table of exports and imports between the two countries showed that existing conditions were most favorable to our people. Our trade was large and increasing and the balance was in our favor to the extent of many millions annually. It is shown by the schedules accompanying the President's message that under this agreement we will surrender two and one-half millions of revenue yearly in excess of the amount surrendered by Canada. If any necessity therefore existed for new trade conditions, it was on the part of Canada and not of the United States. So far, then, the agreement is undeniably to our disadvantage.

Who suggested the making of such an agreement? We had only recently enacted a new tariff law. Business was gradually adjusting itself to new conditions. True, there was dissatisfaction with the new law, as there always is with a new tariff law. The public press wanted to have free paper, but contained no suggestion of free trade for our farm products. The President and others found fault with the wool schedule, but even so, the President declared the law the best tariff law ever placed on the statute book. He did not intimate any desire for free trade for our agriculture.

What political party outside of Massachusetts suggested reciprocity with Canada? What political convention, in what State of the Union, proposed the opening up anew of our tariff law so as to institute free trade in any form between the United States and Canada?

What national convention suggested it? Where in the platform of the Republican Party upon which the President made his appeal to the people and secured his election do you find, directly or indirectly, that reciprocity with Canada is a party policy?

It would appear, then, that in the absence of any discovered necessity and without any popular demand for it this agreement was made by the President and made in secret, for it is not contended that any party leader was consulted with respect to it.

I approach now a question which is of fundamental importance as bearing upon the constitutional relation of the executive and legislative departments of the Government. I do not need to enlarge on the necessity of compelling each of our coordinate departments to confine itself within its own sphere. Any invasion by one department of the rights and functions of another disarranges the whole scheme and operates to deprive one of the powers granted and to clothe another with powers denied. Too much, I fear, in recent years has there been a concentration of power in the executive department.

Whence comes the constitutional power of the President, let me ask, to make an agreement with a foreign nation which shall revise our revenue laws?

And whence comes the power of the House of Representatives to approve such an agreement, in bulk, without exercising its right of judgment and of amendment, unless it renounces its constitutional prerogative to inaugurate revenue measures?

What is the Canadian pact, as the public press has termed it? The President said in his message recently sent to Congress:

In my annual message of December 6, 1910, \* \* \* I also informed you that, by my direction, the Secretary of State had dispatched two representatives of the Department of State as special commissioners to Ottawa to confer with representatives of the Dominion Government, that they were authorized to take steps to formulate a reciprocal trade agreement, and that the Ottawa conferences thus begun had been adjourned to be resumed in Washington.

On the 7th of the present month two cabinet ministers came to Washington as representatives of the Dominion Government, and the conferences were continued between them and the Secretary of State. The result of the negotiations was that on the 21st instant a reciprocal trade agreement was reached, the text of which is herewith transmitted, with accompanying correspondence and other data.

My purpose in making a reciprocal trade agreement with Canada has been not only to obtain one that would be mutually advantageous to both countries, but one which also would be truly national in its scope.

I feel I have correctly interpreted the wish of the American people by expressing in the arrangement now submitted to Congress for its approval their desire for a more intimate and cordial relationship with Canada. I therefore earnestly hope that the measure will be promptly enacted into law.

That which is now before us is called in the message "a reciprocal trade agreement," an "arrangement," and a "measure." It is said to have been made by authority of the President, and it is submitted to Congress for what? To be debated,

deliberated upon, to be amended, to be finally passed upon in such form as Congress may determine? Not at all—to be approved and enacted into law.

It is safe to say that the President has no constitutional power to make an "agreement" or "arrangement" with a foreign power to revise our revenue law, especially in terms which preclude the exercise of any judgment upon the part of Congress or either branch thereof.

The President made a carefully prepared speech at Springfield, from which it is apparent that he assumed he had such power.

He said:

The Constitution provides that the President may make treaties—

*The President may make treaties—*

by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and the treaties when thus made shall constitute the law of the land. It has always been a question, however, whether it was not necessary, in order to carry treaties affecting tariff and revenue measures into effect, to have action by Congress in the form of legislation recognizing and enforcing the treaty.

Mr. Chairman, that is the law. No treaty can be made relating to our revenues that will be effective until it subsequently be indorsed by the Congress of the United States. At the time when the Cuban treaty was indorsed Congress said:

And provided further, That nothing herein contained shall be treated or construed as an admission on the part of the House of Representatives that customs duties can be changed otherwise than by an act of Congress originating in said House.

To continue now the President's speech:

Because of this doubt it was thought wiser on behalf of both Governments not to make a formal treaty.

I do not find in the Constitution of the United States any distinction between a "treaty" and a "formal treaty."

Not to make a formal treaty, but to make an agreement between the Executives by which each, exercising his constitutional power in his Government, should submit the agreement in the form of a statute to be enacted and go into force on condition that a similar statute was passed by the legislature of the other country.

It is apparent from what the President here says that he assents to the proposition that a treaty relating to tariff changes must receive the indorsement of the House of Representatives before it can go into effect, and it is apparent also that he claims to have a power as Executive, beyond the treaty-making power, to make an agreement with a foreign executive changing our tariff laws in terms which shall not be subject to legislative review or amendment.

It does not require any argument to demonstrate that the President has no such constitutional power.

In both the McKinley law and the Dingley law certain powers were conferred on the President to make tariff changes, but the terms were prescribed by Congress, otherwise the changes would have been held unconstitutional as being a delegation of legislative power that Congress could not make.

There are no provisions in existing law similar to those which were in the McKinley and Dingley laws.

In a subsequent part of his speech the President used these terms:

In other words, the great benefit of this treaty is the profit in mutual exchange, etc.

Further on he says:

My own view is that no step could be taken more in the interest of a reasonable policy of protection than the approval of this treaty.

The President's view of his own powers was shared by the Canadian representatives. In their written stipulation accompanying the agreement they provide:

3. It is agreed that the desired tariff changes shall not take the formal shape of a treaty, but that the Governments of the two countries will use their utmost endeavors to bring about such changes by concurrent legislation at Washington and Ottawa.

4. The Government of the countries having made this agreement—

And so forth.

From the foregoing it is apparent that both the President and the Canadian representatives entered into what they both recognized as an informal treaty, but what they called an agreement. Whether the Canadian representatives had power to make either a trade agreement or a treaty I do not undertake to say, but I do assert with the utmost confidence that the President had no power to make any agreement changing our revenue laws except such as is conferred on him by the treaty-making clause of the Constitution. And any agreement so made, to be effective, must receive, first, the approval of two-thirds of the Senate and, second, the indorsement of the Congress.

Should the pending bill be passed by a majority of the votes of both Houses, you will have as the result only the unauthorized legislative indorsement of an unauthorized Executive act, and I apprehend that the constitutional powers of the House



and the constitutional power of the Executive are not beyond the power of judicial definition. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But you say this is "a bill to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes." But that is not true. *It is a bill to validate a reciprocal trade agreement made by the President with certain Canadian officials so as to make changes in our revenue law.* But the Constitution provides "all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives." To say that this bill originated in the House of Representatives is merely to juggle with words. The bill, even in form, originated in the Executive department. The form, however, amounts to nothing. It is the President's agreement that you are called upon to ratify. That is the substance; that originated with the Executive.

The power to originate revenue measures comprises the power (1) to choose the subjects of taxation and (2) to name the rate of tax. In this measure, whereby you are asked—to use the language of the President—to put "*the agreement in the form of a statute*," the President and the Canadian commissioners have selected the objects of taxation and also the rates of tax, and you can not dot an "i" or cross a "t." So bound and helpless is the House of Representatives in dealing with this measure that in the last Congress it was jammed through the House under a drastic rule, which not only prohibited amendment but prevented its being read. Now, in this Congress, open proclamation is made by the majority that no amendment will be permitted, because such amendment would jeopardize the agreement.

In all its history the House of Representatives never before knew so humiliating a day as this, called upon, as it is, to renounce its constitutional prerogative and register an Executive decree.

It remains to be seen whether the Senate will renounce its constitutional prerogative as sharer in the treaty-making power.

Of course it is the sheerest sophistry to contend that the adoption by Congress of the President's agreement is equivalent in law to its inception in Congress. To adopt is not to originate.

But suppose that both House and Senate renounce their constitutional functions, pass this measure by majority votes, and that it be signed by the President. What then? Ostensibly it becomes a law. The correction of the Members of the House and Senate who have failed in their duty belongs to their constituents. The law, however, will still require the approval of a competent tribunal before it can be effective.

I have challenged an answer to the question, What necessity existed for the making of this agreement at this time? And to the other question, What popular demand was there for it? I proceed further to ask, What do its advocates urge in its behalf? Very little; very little. They have spent all of their time in trying to demonstrate that it will do us no harm. They have been and are strictly on the defensive.

Men on the other side of the Chamber have been loud in its praises as a Democratic free-trade measure, and have enthusiastically supported it as the first step in the destruction of the protective system. Men on this side of the Chamber have devoted their efforts to show that free trade in farm products will not hurt the farmer, and furthermore is in strict accord with the policies and platforms of the Republican Party. All of them have avowed themselves protectionists. All of them have opposed free trade except when it was baptized "reciprocity." Of course the catchword in the mouth of the advocates of this iniquitous measure is the high cost of living—an appeal to the populace—pass this measure and you will get free food. These are the gentlemen who perform the equestrian feat of riding two horses going in different directions at the same time. Free trade with Canada will reduce the price of the farmer's product to the consumer, but it will not reduce the value of the farmer's product to the farmer. Other gentlemen are honest enough to follow the President, who tells us in his message that this measure will not have any perceptible present effect upon prices, that high prices are world-wide, due to many causes, and that any effect thereon must be looked for in the future. If this statement were made to the kind of people whose support of this measure is gained by their belief in it as a relief from high prices, I apprehend there would be a sudden and wholesale desertion.

There is no intelligent man who does not know that there is nothing in the suggestion of relief from high prices by this measure that would justify a revolution in our revenue system, such a revolution as the enactment of this measure would inevitably bring about.

But there is a necessity to increase our foreign trade; hence we must have free trade with Canada in farm products. Here again I find myself in an impenetrable maze of argument, hopelessly groping for the light. The gentleman from Massachusetts

[Mr. McCall] tells us in one breath that our surplus is rapidly diminishing and that in the future we must draw from Canadian surplus or starve; and then, when he has recovered his breath from that statement, he tells us that we must build up Canada, so as to procure customers for our surplus. [Applause on the Republican side.] The gentleman from Massachusetts is entitled to credit for an original plan for securing foreign trade. Build up the foreigner. "Remove this tariff," says the gentleman, speaking of Canada, "and she will soon gain the strength and stature of a great nation." "You increase the purchasing power of a customer, and you thereby increase your own prosperity," says the gentleman. I recall, in this connection, a quotation from Mr. McKinley's introduction to Mr. Curtis's book, "Protection and Prosperity." He says:

The people of no nation in the history of the world has ever prospered under a policy which sacrificed home industries to build up and develop the resources and give employment to the labor of foreign states.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

We do not need this measure to secure the Canadian market. That market is already ours. The President tells us in his message that the entire foreign trade of Canada in the fiscal year 1910 was \$655,000,000; that her imports were \$376,000,000, and of this amount the United States contributed \$223,000,000. In point of fact, to be exact, our exports to Canada last year, 1910, were \$241,809,233. Our imports from Canada were \$103,256,955. The balance of trade in our favor was \$138,552,278, or 134.20 per cent of exports over imports. Our exports to all other countries were \$1,622,682,411, and our imports were \$1,459,667,296, the balance of trade in our favor being \$163,015,115, or 11.17 per cent of exports over imports. We already have 60 per cent of Canada's trade. Talk about passing this measure for the purpose of securing foreign trade! That foreign trade we already have.

We do not need this measure to increase our trade with Canada. She is now our best customer. Why? Because she can not help herself. She is our best customer, not as a matter of sentiment, but because she can buy to better advantage in our markets than in any other. Self-interest compels her to deal with us. Why, our exports to Canada have increased from \$28,000,000 in 1866, when the former treaty was denounced, to \$241,000,000 last year. And they will go on increasing as the demands of the Canadian market increase and the ability of the American producer to supply increases, and nothing can prevent it unless it be some such bungling piece of statesmanship as this proposed treaty. [Applause on the Republican side.] Why antagonize the great farming interests of every State of the Union to pursue a mere will-o'-the-wisp? It is not statesmanship, it is not common sense.

But failing to find any other reason why we should abandon our ancient landmarks, the advocates of this measure rise to the plane of a lofty altruism, beautifully demonstrated by my friend from Massachusetts in his peroration. The Canadians, it is urged, are our neighbors; for 3,000 miles their boundary is our boundary; we are the same race, speak the same tongue, inherit the same traditions, and have similar institutions.

Well, what of it? What is this arrangement—a treaty of peace and amity, an arbitration agreement, or what the gentleman from Connecticut calls it—a plain business proposition, a question of national revenues, of common everyday dollars and cents? Sentiment is not business. Revenue measures are not made on sentiment. The Canadians do not pay our taxes, maintain our schools, our churches, or our charities; they do not build our roads, maintain our Army, or contribute to our Navy. They do not fight our battles. True, living alongside of us, they have been decent enough not to require us to maintain an army to keep them in order. [Applause.] But, true again, living alongside of them, we have not compelled them to maintain an army to keep us in order. True, we are coinheritors of the traditions of English liberty, but only down to the point where our fathers, through blood and sacrifice, extended that liberty to and established it in the United States, while the men of Canada remained still English dependents. Because in common we claim kinship with the great names of English literature, with Shakespeare, and Milton, and Byron, and Tennyson, with the exponents of English statesmanship—Burke and Fox and William Pitt—we may well rejoice. But it is a subject of rejoicing and not of business. It furnishes no reason why we should exchange a good American dollar for a Canadian half dollar. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Sentiment is a grand thing; it rules the world of civilized intercourse, but among cool-headed business men it has no place in the world of trade. It played no part in the long and bitter fisheries disputes with our dear Canadian brethren. It played no part in the settlement of Canada's irritating, arro-

gant, and unfounded claim in connection with the Alaskan boundary line.

If neighborhood and kinship of race and language and history furnish reasons why trade barriers should be removed, they furnish equally good reasons why political barriers should be removed and the two peoples consolidated under one flag. And disavow much as we may any intention in that direction, if we adopt this measure the force of events will ultimately assert itself to that end. This bill itself in its new section proposes another step toward bringing together the two peoples under one flag, and that flag will bear the Stars and Stripes.

O no, my friends, when it comes to a matter of sentiment my heart goes out to my own people; my patriotism is American, not Canadian patriotism; my brotherly love is for my own kin, for the American farmer, not for his Canadian competitor. [Applause on the Republican side.]

In the absence of any good reason why this bill should pass there are many and potent reasons why it should not.

It is unnecessary, not responsive to the popular demand, disturbing of the business interests of the country.

But more than that, it is unfair to the farmer, whose interests in particular it attacks.

I do not want to weary the committee with a restatement of the argument which has been so well presented by many of those who have preceded me. The history of American agriculture, its gradual extension westward to the possession of new and fertile fields, with the result that older and less fertile fields had to be abandoned, has been vividly portrayed. The similarity of the situation now, if the vast luxuriously fertile fields of Canada are to be brought into competition with our western farms, to the situation as it existed in our earlier years has been pointed out. The same economic law that worked to the disadvantage of eastern agriculture when western farms were established will operate as to Canadian and western farms, and in like manner and with like result.

It is easy to juggle with figures and by a proper selection of them establish almost anything. Doubtless there are some Canadian lands as high in price as some American lands, some places where there is little difference between Canadian wages and Canadian prices and our wages and prices, but they are the exception and not the rule, and anyone who will be honest with himself must agree that as a general proposition Canadian lands are cheaper than American lands, Canadian wages less than American wages, Canadian prices less than American prices; that Canada has a territory of vast proportions, capable of producing almost limitless quantities of grain from a soil fertile beyond any soil on this side of the international boundary line.

It seems to me, discarding special pleas, the conclusion must inevitably be that the possibilities of Canadian agriculture are such as to put American agriculture in competition with it at a great disadvantage. As a consequence, free trade with Canada in farm products must inure to the disadvantage of the American farmer. Taking the agreement as a whole, it can not but inure to the advantage of Canada and to the disadvantage of the United States.

We do not need to rely on theory to establish that proposition. It has already been established in actual experience. I need not enlarge upon this point, because it has been fully discussed both by myself in the last Congress and by various gentlemen in the course of this debate. I then asserted and now assert that the reciprocity treaty of 1854, which was denounced in 1866 and which is similar to the proposed agreement, worked disastrously to the United States and was denounced for that reason.

Gentlemen have denied both propositions. Without adducing any figures by way of proof, they dogmatically assert, first, that it did not operate against our interests, and, second, that it was denounced for political and not for economic reasons, one gentleman asserting that it was denounced on account of our indignation because of Canada's friendship to the Southern Confederacy. But there are two things that have not been and can not be denied: First, that under the operation of that treaty in 12 years our exports to Canada dwindled from nearly \$20,000,000 to a little over \$15,000,000, while Canada's exports to us grew from \$12,000,000 to \$46,000,000; that in the last two years of that treaty's life we remitted to Canada duties amounting to over \$70,000,000 and lost the balance of trade by over \$28,000,000.

These facts have not been and can not be denied. Nor can it be denied, in the second place, that every contemporaneous statesman of note in our history declared the treaty to have been disastrous to the interest of the United States and that it was denounced for that reason.

I recur to this proposition at this time only because in statesmanship, as in everything else, it is wise to take the lessons of

experience. And if that treaty, through its 12 years of life under like conditions to those presented now, was disastrous to the interests of the United States, to all the interests of the United States, both her industries and her revenues, we have the right to assume—we would be foolish not to assume—that the enactment of this law now would bring about precisely the same results.

In this connection I ought to refer to the fact stated by the gentleman who preceded me, that ever since the denouncement of the Elgin treaty Canada has been importuning us to enter into a similar treaty, and to call attention to the fact that every administration, from that of Franklin Pierce down to the present administration, has refused to enter into negotiations with Canada for a treaty for the exchange of natural products. Why, so late as the administration of Mr. Harrison, in 1892, Mr. Blaine told the Canadian envoys that we would not entertain any proposition for an agreement looking to the exchange of natural products, because, he said "the benefits of such an exchange would be almost wholly with the people of Canada."

Talk about reciprocal treaties in competitive articles! Why, in the very nature of the case there can be no reciprocal treaty in competitive articles. Exchange of competitive articles means competition. Reciprocity means the trading of the things that we have for the things that we do not have.

But, Mr. Chairman, you may discuss the question of prices, you may discuss the question of agricultural interests, and many other incidental questions, and you will not, after all, have reached the fundamental and dominating issue in this case. Until this bill was introduced it was the universally accepted belief that the protective system, against that of free trade, was the accepted economic policy of the United States. Parties divided on rates of duties. The Republican Party stood for such duties as would furnish protection to American capital and American labor. The Democratic Party stood for rates of duty levied for revenue only. This bill looks neither to protection nor revenue. It deprives us of revenue. It is an open, avowed free-trade measure. It is such upon its face, and it is so declared to be by the Democratic Party.

Its significance lies in the fact—mark me, its significance lies in the fact—that this is the first step in the destruction of the protective system. That system is a complete logical whole, and it admits of no exceptions. It must apply to all industries, or it will not be permitted to apply to any. [Applause on the Republican side.] If the farmer can not have adequate protection for his industry, the manufacturer will not have protection for his. No system of protection is practicable or would be just some of whose schedules are protective and some of which are nonprotective.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], who honored me with so much of his attentions, portrayed me as shedding tears for the farmer while I had in mind the manufacturer. The gentleman from North Carolina in part was right. I had both the farmer and the manufacturer in mind. When you direct my attention to the subject of a tariff I always have in mind the great city, dear to my heart, whose interests it is my highest ambition to serve. I recall its pillar of cloud by day, its pillar of fire by night, the roar of its machinery, its myriad workmen in the receipt of the highest wages paid any workmen in any place on earth [applause], a city which is a shining exemplar of the beneficent results of the system of protection. And when I have in mind the fact that if the farmer be robbed of his protection my great city will be robbed of its protection I refuse to participate in the robbery. [Applause on the Republican side.]

This measure rises high above mere considerations of temporary profit. It means more than bookkeeping and a balancing of accounts. It involves the integrity of a system whose foundation was laid in the first legislative act of the First Congress, which has received the indorsement of the most distinguished names in our history, and under which we have grown to a height of prosperity unprecedented in the world's annals. The system is essentially a Republican system. From the hour of its birth until this present hour the Republican Party has stood for protection; protection for American capital, for American labor, whether in the field, the factory, or the mine, to the end that there should be established a great home market which should be for Americans, and that the high standard of American civilization should be preserved.

Under its fostering influence cities have been founded, have grown and multiplied. North and South, East and West have been bound together in inseparable brotherhood by bands of steel. Progress has taken its resistless march across the continent, overcoming all the barriers of nature, planting fields and reaping harvests, until even the desert has been made to blossom like the rose. [Applause on the Republican side.] Its



encouraging inspiration has given birth to a hardy race of pioneer sons, whose singleness of purpose, whose energy and aggressiveness and patriotism have given to the world the wonderful story of the winning of the West. [Applause on the Republican side.] Are we going to turn our backs on those hardy pioneer sons and their sons by the abolition of a system to which they owe their success and which is essential to its continuance? Already hundreds of thousands of them, lured by the promises of the luxuriantly fertile fields of Canada, have left their western farms to become a part of our neighbor's population and add to her wealth. Shall we tempt other thousands upon increasing thousands to abandon our fields for Canadian fields, taking with them the virtues that constitute good citizenship? Any policy that takes from us our boys and girls, the good red blood of American manhood and womanhood, that depletes the valley of the Mississippi and the plains of the West and lowers farm values here while increasing them across the border, robs us of our dearest and most valuable possession. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I can not stop to demonstrate at length why no Republican, in my judgment, can consistently vote for this measure. I would like to ask him one or two questions:

First. Do you not believe that the cost of production of farm products is less in Canada than it is in the United States? And if you do, then how can you escape the conclusion that to put farm products on the free list is to violate the pledge of the last Republican platform? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Second. Do you believe the testimony of the Mann committee and of the President's Tariff Board (and neither of these has been contradicted) to the effect that it costs from \$2 to \$4.14 more to make a ton of paper in the United States than it does in Canada?

If you do, then how can you escape the conclusion that to put paper on the free list is a violation of the pledge of the last Republican platform? [Applause on the Republican side.]

I beg for a conscientious reply to these queries. It is vital. The Republican Party as the party of protection is on trial here to-day. You and I, my Republican brethren, are on trial. As we respond, so shall we and our party, the party of McKinley, be dealt with in the great forum of the American electorate. Sometimes it is swayed by popular clamor, sometimes by the shadow of a great name, but in the end its deliberate judgment is true to righteousness; its last verdict invariably loyal to the loyal. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the enactment into law of this bill, in my judgment, marks the end of an era in the economic policy of our country so far as our customs laws affect the industrial conditions of the Nation.

The period of exclusion has passed; the era of honest competition is here. [Applause.]

For 50 years the Republican Party has maintained the policy of excluding from the home market, as far as it has been able to do so, competitive products from other countries.

In the beginning this policy was inaugurated with the express declaration that it was intended to develop new industries until they were strong enough to stand alone and face in the open markets of the world the rivalry of our productive competitors, but the greed for gain has driven the advocates of this theory far beyond the position they maintained at its inception. To-day there is hardly a great American industry that is not exporting its surplus products to the open markets of the world and selling them in free competition with the manufactured goods and crops of our foreign competitors.

Our agricultural implements supply the farmers' wants beyond the seas. Our boots and shoes are worn by people who speak many foreign languages and who tread the highways of the Occident and the Orient. The looms of our factories clothe the people of distant lands. The freight of our foreign rivals is carried to market on American rails, drawn by American engines, across chasms spanned by American-built bridges. [Applause.] The harvests of our farmers feed the toiling masses of Europe. We would be the unrivaled masters of production and industry in every land where free competition can be obtained if we would but strike off the shackles that bind us to the dead and unnecessary economic system maintained by the Republican Party, that creates false standards and wasteful conditions at home. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I recognize that these false standards have been engrafted on our industrial life and that we can not strike them all off in an hour or a day without serious danger. What I contend for is that we turn our faces away from them and gradually and carefully adjust our laws to meet the new conditions that face us, without serious injury to either labor or capital, in order that we may reduce the cost of living at home and be prepared to dispose of more of our surplus products in the markets of

the world, to the end that we may give constant employment to labor and maintain stable prices at home.

The Democratic Party does not intend to abandon the custom-houses, but favors a policy of levying customs duties for revenue purposes only, at rates that will not destroy fair and honest competition in the home market. [Applause.] This position will be accomplished by the reduction of tariff taxes provided for in the laws now on the statute books to a point where fair competition will bring about reasonable prices and destroy monopolistic tendencies. [Applause.]

I say that this bill marks the end of an era in the economic life of the Nation. Why? Not that the immediate results will be far-reaching, but because it takes one step in the right direction, a step away from the exclusive protective policy, a step toward an honest competitive policy.

The advocates of the Republican policy of protection have always heretofore insisted that reciprocal trade agreements should only be made to affect noncompeting products. This bill embraces in its terms competitive products of both nations and recognizes the Democratic position that no tariff law is either warranted or just that protects the profits of the producer and destroys honest competition.

The bill under consideration will carry into law a reciprocal agreement negotiated by our Government with the Government of the Dominion of Canada. In the year 1910 the trade of Canada with all the world was \$693,211,221; her total imports were \$385,835,103; the people of the United States sending her \$233,071,155 of this amount, and from the rest of the world she received only \$152,763,940.

As the population of Canada is about 7,500,000 it appears that she bought from us about \$30 worth of goods for each person living in the Dominion of Canada. This is a remarkable showing considering the fact that our trade is held back by tariff laws that as to the mother country discriminate against us.

Our own import figures show for the same year imports coming into this country from Canada to the amount of \$95,128,310, about \$1 per capita. They take of us \$30 per capita and we take of them \$1 per capita. They are a new country and a growing country. Of necessity they will take our products in excess of our taking theirs. Did not the great Eastern States three decades ago live and thrive on the development of the West? Will not the already developed States of the Union grow and prosper on the development of the new Provinces of Canada if you tear down the artificial wall and give us an opportunity for fair trade?

There has been a great deal said in the debate in the House about the farmers in the Northern States being opposed to this pact. It has been contended that the opposition to this pact comes from the agricultural classes of America. My friends, there is no doubt that to-day a number, and possibly a large number, of the farmers of the Northern States are opposed to this pact. Why? Because they have been assiduously campaigned by certain great protected interests that do not dare show their own hands above the surface. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

They have been misled by false facts and false statements coming from men who desire to maintain the high protective principles of the Republican party, which protected their profits and made the toiling masses serve them as their masters. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We have not had the suggestion made by those who oppose the bill that the real opposition was coming from the great protected lumber interests of this country [applause on the Democratic side], but we know it and you know it. I hold in my hand a circular letter, sent out by the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, of which Edward Hines, of Chicago, is the President—Edward Hines, of recent uncertain fame. Let me read it:

THE NATIONAL LUMBER MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION,  
Chicago, Ill., March 17, 1911.

To members of affiliated associations:

DEAR SIR: As a member of an association affiliated with the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association you are doubtless interested in the proposed so-called reciprocity agreement with Canada and the action of the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association against its adoption in its present form.

Lumber producers of the United States are doubtless interested in different degrees in this subject, but we believe that all feel that the singling out of the sawmills of the country to bear so large a share of the burden of this reciprocity, without any compensating advantages whatever, is in the highest degree unfair, and that we may be justly indignant, regardless of the degree of harm inflicted upon us, by treatment so discriminatory. The protest made to the Senate, a copy of which is sent you, contains a condensed statement of the chief grounds of objection to the agreement.

The agreement which, chiefly because of our efforts, failed to become a law at the last session of Congress, will, of course, be presented at the opening of the extra session, April 4, and we would call for your immediate personal assistance in so presenting the objections to the agreement to your Representatives in Congress and Senators, of whatever party, that this ill-considered and unreciprocal arrangement shall not become law.

Whatever the ultimate effect of the arrangement may be, it is evident that for the time being it will disturb business, upset values of lumber, tend to increase the value of Canadian stumpage at the expense of American, and will affect the credit of American lumber institutions.

We would suggest that you see your banks and discuss the agreement with them along these lines:

First. The credit of lumber concerns in the United States. The past three years have been severe ones in the lumber industry generally, and in some sections almost disastrous. The agreement will make matters worse, rather than better. Should not the banks use all their influence on those in power to prevent a further demoralization of a business which in some sections furnishes so large a portion of their business and revenues? And should not they protest against that which will inevitably tend to depreciate the value of the securities they hold?

Second. The agricultural features of the agreement tend directly to put American and Canadian agricultural land values upon an equality. American farmers have been going by the tens of thousands to Canada within the last few years because they could there get low-priced lands which are as productive or more productive than those at home, unless the latter are to be artificially fertilized at much expense. The extent and character of this movement of American farmers to Canada is sufficient proof of the facts. Our banks, insurance companies, private investors, and other financial interests have immense amounts of capital invested in American farm securities. Do they want the value of these securities depreciated?

Further, great efforts have been made during the last two or three years, with some success, to arouse renewed interest in American land investments, and therefore to check the movement of American farmers and capital to the Canadian Northwest. Great progress has been made in arousing interest in the long-neglected farm lands of the East, the cut-over lands of the South, North, and West, the swamp lands of the East and South, and the irrigated lands of the West. This movement, so promising to all our American interests, will receive a setback which will not be recovered from for years if the reciprocity agreement goes into effect, for with all the tariff barriers removed the cheaper Canadian lands will be as attractive, acre for acre, as those in this country.

American farmers who wish the value of their farm lands as well as of their products maintained should interest themselves in this matter, as indeed they are already doing, and the thousands of protests which came in from farmers and farmers' organizations during the last two weeks of the session did much to prevent the adoption of the reciprocity bill.

Your customers among the retail lumbermen in the agricultural districts of the North should be especially interested in the above arguments, for the passage of the reciprocity bill is certain, because of the feeling and apprehension it will cause among the farmers, with its reflex action upon the banks, to lead to a material curtailment of business and therefore lessen the demands of these customers upon yourself.

We would therefore ask you at once to take up this question with your banks and trust companies, land companies, and farmers (and with your retail yard customers, if you think it wise), and have them reach their Congressmen and Senators before the opening of Congress and continue the work after it convenes.

Your own protest, of course, will be emphatic, and we would suggest that you secure the cooperation of other lumber manufacturers who are not members of your association and so far as possible interest your workmen in the matter, as the adoption of the agreement, which admits Canadian lumber free into the United States, while Canada retains her restrictions on log exports, will necessarily stimulate the construction and operation of mills in Canada at the expense of those in this country.

I should be glad to be advised of how you feel about this matter and what you are doing regarding it. I inclose list of the Representatives from your State and the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee of the new House, which is now at work on tariff revision, including the reciprocity measure.

Respectfully, yours,

THE NATIONAL LUMBER MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION,  
LEONARD BRONSON, Manager.

I call to your attention two paragraphs. He goes on to explain to his brother lumbermen the dangerous straits in which they find themselves, and urges them to call on their bankers and their grocerymen and their farmer friends to come to their rescue and save the downtrodden lumber interests. I read again one of the paragraphs in his letter:

American farmers who wish the value of their farm lands as well as of their products maintained should interest themselves in this matter, as indeed they are already doing, and the thousands of protests which came in from farmers and farmers' organizations during the last two weeks of the session did much to prevent the adoption of the reciprocity bill.

He refers to the last session of Congress. That is, the farmer who is contending for free lumber with which to build his humble home, the farmer for whom the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin says he stands, for whom he is calling for free lumber—this same farmer is appealed to by this Lumber Trust to defeat the legislation that gives him free lumber with which to build his home. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But the trust goes further. Here is one of the concluding clauses of this letter:

We therefore ask you at once to take up this question with your banks and trust companies and land companies and farmers and with your retail yard customers, if you think it wise [laughter], and have them write their Congressmen and Senators before the opening of Congress, and continue the work after it convenes.

My friends, have you ever before heard of the great protected interests of the country, the great monopolistic interests, appealing to the bankers to put the pressure on the poor devil that has a loan to force him to stand for their interests? [Applause on Democratic side.]

Asking the banker! Here it is in black and white, a letter from Mr. Hines, the president of the Lumber Trust, appealing

to the bankers of this country to put the screws to the farmers who had borrowed money from them, to appeal to their Representatives in Congress to maintain a high protective tariff for the lumber interests. That is not all.

I wish to read from the New York American a statement which a reporter gathered from Mr. Wakeman, the president of the American Protective Tariff League, the league that stands for prohibitive taxation for protecting profits in the interest of monopoly. Mr. Wakeman issued a statement, sent out to those who stand with him, and his statement reads as follows:

Will you and your connections kindly wire the following Congressmen at Washington quick, urging them to vote against the Canadian reciprocity agreement?

I shall omit the names. It was an appeal to those protected interests to wire to you gentlemen on that side of the center aisle and to you gentlemen on this side of the House to vote against this bill because it was an attack on the protected interests of this country. When the newspaper reporter asked Mr. Wakeman if that was an official letter and if he stood for it, this was what he said.

That telegram was sent out Monday afternoon, after the executive committee of the league had met and authorized me to send it.

He further said:

We designated the men named because we have reason to believe they have been carried off their Republican faith by President Taft and are about to commit harakiri for themselves and the country by joining the Democratic House in endorsing the Taft un-Republican measure of reciprocity with Canada. What we aim at is to ally the Republican majority of the House as solidly as possible against reciprocity and thus make the unpatriotic Democratic majority wholly responsible for its passage. It will then go to the Republican Senate as a distinctly Democratic proposition, and then let the Republican Senate, if it dare, give its sanction to it.

Listen to your masters! [Prolonged applause on the Democratic side.]

The Senate of the United States, the body that in times past has protected the liberties of the American people, are told by the head of this Protective Tariff League that they dare not pass this bill. Afraid of whom? Not the people; afraid of the trusts. Ah, my friends, but it comes nearer home than that. The protected interests of this country know well that this bill will make a break in the dike; that whenever the protective tariff is removed and the northern farmer stands out alone without pretense of protection to his products that he can no longer be counted on to stand in the ranks of the monopolistic interests of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is why they are afraid of it. It is not so much what is in the bill, but they know that the death knell of the protection system will have sounded—that protection that means the protection of enormous profits and the creation of monopolies in this country—when the farmer understands and abandons the Republican Party to those alone who have fattened upon his hard-earned dollars. They are using, my friends, every effort in the districts on that side of the House and in your district, my fellow Democrat and in my district to break the column. I have protected interests in my district, but I do not represent them. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I represent the great mass of my constituency who want honest treatment and fair play. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Two years ago, when the proposition came before the House to cut the tariff on iron and steel products, in many cases about half, I favored the proposition because I thought it was just and fair, but some of the protected interests in my district met and passed resolutions, and resolved that they would rebuke me if I voted to reduce the tax on iron and steel. I voted to make the reduction [applause on the Democratic side], but they did not turn me out of Congress [applause on the Democratic side], and they will not turn you out of Congress if you stand true to the people you represent. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], when he addressed the House several days ago, stated that the United States Steel Corporation was in favor of this bill and asked if I did not know it, or if that was not the reason why I favored it. As I then stated to the gentleman from Illinois, I was not informed as to the wishes of the United States Steel Corporation. As a matter of fact, I am interested in the iron and steel business myself. Everything I have in the world is in the iron and steel business except my home, but not with the United States Steel Corporation. My people are independent manufacturers. We meet the United States Steel Corporation every day of our existence in a competitive battle on the industrial fields of America. My people have not asked me to vote for a protective tariff on iron and steel.

I stated to the gentleman from Illinois that I did not know the position of the United States Steel Corporation in reference to this bill, and at the time I stated it I did not know, but I will say to him to-day I do know. I know where they stand to-day. I am in receipt of telegrams from my district



to-day stating that the United States Steel Corporation have stopped work on some of the great plants in my district, have turned 3,000 men out of employment, and have given as their reason that I was supporting the Democratic tariff bills that are before the House. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I regret that this great trust should punish the constituency that I represent because of the position I take here, but I can say this to you: I stand to-day where I stood two years ago—for an honest revision of the tariff schedules. I propose to vote for this bill and the free-list bill without amendment because I believe they are right [applause on the Democratic side], and I care not what may be the effect on my personal fortunes if we can put on the statute books even the first step toward breaking down the system of monopolistic protection. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If you want to vote for the trusts and the monopolies of this country, vote against this bill. If you wish to take this one step in breaking down the protective wall, there can be no question as to what your duty is to yourselves and your constituencies. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

They say that this bill is unfair because it brings the American farmer into competition with the Canadian farmer. Why should he not be brought into competition? Is there any reason? Members on that side of the Chamber may give as the reason that they believe in protecting the producers' profits, favoring special classes, and allowing the Government to guarantee to their favorites the right to tax the people.

They may make that statement, but we have never stood for such a proposition. I have never been able to see why the great manufacturers in my district, or the farmers, or anybody else, should have their profits protected any more than I can see why the grocer, or the mechanic, or the merchant, or the lawyer should have his profits protected by the Government.

Whenever you enter the realm of protection, of necessity you must enter the zone of protecting profits. And whenever you enact a tariff bill high enough to protect a man's profits, you have a tariff levied, not for revenue, but for the sole purpose of protection.

But why should we fear competition from these Canadian farmers? Their standards are the same as our standards. They are our people. There is no difference between us. The Canadian farmer lives in as good a home as the American farmer. His children go to as good a school and wear as good clothes. He has as much meat on the table and he indulges in the same luxuries. He lives up to our standard of life and living. Therefore, when we have him as a competitor we are not tearing down American standards in any way.

But they say he can produce cheaper. The climatic conditions of his country are more rigorous than are ours. Every year that he plants his crops he is in more danger of losing them, because the spring commences later and the fall begins earlier than with us. He must harvest more hay and grain to take care of his cattle in the winter and keep them in the barn longer than our farmers do, because there are nearly two months more of winter that the Canadian farmer has to contend with than does the farmer in the States. Can you say that this does not go into the cost of raising his crops? Is he not at that disadvantage? Why, no man can deny the proposition.

But they say he has cheaper land. The argument has been made repeatedly here that the cheap lands of Kansas and Minnesota 10 years ago did not destroy the high-priced land of Indiana and Illinois. You know that. Instead of the land of Illinois and Indiana being destroyed by the farm products that came from the cheaper lands of the West, the lands doubled in value. There is a greater difference in value in this country between the land in the Dakotas and Minnesota and Illinois and Indiana than there is between the land in the Provinces of Manitoba and Alberta and the land of Minnesota and the Dakotas. The reason the land is cheap in Canada is because they either can not produce as much per acre or, for the better reason, because they are farther away from the market and it costs more for freight to bring their commodities to the market of ultimate sale and to dispose of them than it does from the higher-priced land near the center of population. That is all there is to it.

There is not a single argument that can be advanced legitimately to show that the Canadian farmer can produce a crop of any kind cheaper than the American farmer can. Then, if that is the case, the sole argument that can be contended for on that side of the House in favor of maintaining this tariff in the interest of the American farmer is that his profits should be protected.

I wish my friend, my insurgent friend, my progressive friend from Wisconsin, were here. I would like to ask him if he stands for protecting the profits of the farmer. He stood with us last

year on a great battle field for the rights of this House. But that was merely a parliamentary battle field. He proclaimed himself a progressive, a man that was in advance of his party. He said that he would not vote for the Payne tariff bill because it put unjust taxation upon the American people.

But when the gentleman faces the question of cutting off protection to the profits of his own constituency, he falters at the gate, and is unwilling to make those reductions for his own constituency that he desired to make for the constituency of other men. Ah, my friends, you may call that "progressive," but you only call it "progressive." I say to you that no man can reform the world unless he first be willing to reform himself.

Mr. CULLOP. I notice yesterday wheat in Winnipeg, Canada, was quoted at 92½ cents per bushel while in Chicago it was 89 cents a bushel, in St. Louis it was 86 cents and in Kansas City 84 cents per bushel. This seems to be about the difference daily of the Winnipeg market over the Chicago market. Now, if wheat is higher in Canada, as the quotations daily show, will removing the duty on wheat in any manner injure the farmers of the United States?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It will not.

Mr. CULLOP. Under the drawback clause of the Payne tariff bill, which provides that all duties on raw material brought into this country for manufacturing products for exportation are relieved of all tariff charges except 1 per cent of the tariff levied, which the Government charges for handling the transaction, is it not true that the miller can import wheat for the manufacture of his export flour, and instead of paying the tariff of 25 cents a bushel it is only 1 per cent of 25 cents a bushel, and he can thereby secure all such wheat from Canada or any other country practically without any tariff at all, so that the tariff on wheat, because of this fact, is practically removed now under the Payne bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is correct.

Mr. CULLOP. Chicago being the initial wheat market for the Mississippi Valley, does not the difference in price between places like St. Louis, Kansas City, and similar points represent the cost of transportation charges from said points to Chicago and the middleman's profit in handling the grain?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly; that is true.

Mr. Chairman, we have discussed the wheat problem so much during the last few days in the House that I hardly feel as though I were justified in saying anything further in reference to that matter, but I want to call attention to this fact, that in the year 1910 the production of wheat in the United States amounted to 695,443,000 bushels. We exported 46,679,876 bushels, or 6.71 per cent. Canada that year produced 149,000,000 bushels of wheat and exported 49,741,350 bushels, or 33 per cent.

Now, I want to ask the other side this question: If the outside world, the markets of Europe, had not absorbed that 49,000,000 bushels of export Canadian wheat, if Canada had sent to this country every bushel of her export wheat, what would have been the result? The European market of necessity would have been 49,741,350 bushels behind the demand. They consumed that 49,741,350 bushels, and if you had taken it away from them and put it into this country, they would have been short that amount. If the European market had been short 49,741,350 bushels, would they not have been ready to consume 49,741,350 bushels of wheat from us at the world's price?

My friends, one strange thing about your party on that side of the House is that you are prepared at any time to deny the economic laws of the universe when it suits your purpose, and to reassert them when you desire to do so. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] Fifteen years ago you denied—your leaders on that side of the House denied—the quantitative theory of money. You said that it did not make any difference how much money you had in circulation; it did not measure your values. And yet last year a distinguished committee of Senators representing your party filed a report on the cost of living in this country and asserted that the cost of living had increased because the amount of money in the country had increased and sent up prices by decreasing the purchasing power of the money.

Fifteen years ago you were on one side of the question and to-day you are on the other. Until this debate commenced, I never heard any man assert the theory that as to the great world crops, like those of wheat and cotton, the surplus crop, where a nation was continually exporting a portion of the crop, did not fix the price. And yet the exigencies of the day, the difficulties of the hour, have driven you to a position where you deny all economic laws and say that the value of your crop is not fixed by the surplus that you send to the markets of Liverpool and London. If they are—and they are, and you know it is true—then what difference does it make whether

you have an artificial tariff barrier between this country and Canada or not, so far as your wheat crop is concerned, because the price of the wheat crop will be fixed by the price you obtain for the wheat that you send to European markets, just as our cotton crop in the Southern States is fixed by the world's supply and the world's demand. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HELGESEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question? The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. HELGESEN. If the gentleman will answer this one question, I think he can satisfy the farmers of this country that his side is right and that they are wrong on this question. I live in the State of North Dakota. Up there we have a town where half of the town is in North Dakota and the other half in Saskatchewan. One of the principal streets forms the boundary line. How do you account for the fact that the millers for years have been paying from 10 to 12 cents a bushel more for wheat, and the maltsters have been paying from 10 to 25 or 30 cents more for barley, and the merchants have been paying from 20 to 25 cents more for flax on the American side of that street than on the Canadian side? If the Liverpool market or the markets of the world control the price, how do you account for that fact?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is easy enough. I am not talking about local markets or local conditions. I of necessity recognize the fact, for example, that if the District of Columbia were the only market a farmer had in which to sell his produce in this neighborhood, and you put a policeman on the outer border of this District of Columbia and forced the farmer living in Maryland or Virginia to pay a tax for the privilege of bringing his produce into this particular town, it would be true that he could not sell his produce for as high a price outside as he could inside, because in the immediate local neighborhood his market is limited, and for him to take his produce to Baltimore or somewhere else would cost him additional freight charges. What I say does not apply to immediate local conditions. I have no doubt that, if this bill passes, there may be some towns in North Dakota where the price may be affected slightly. On the other hand, I have no doubt there will be some towns in Canada where the price will be affected adversely; but we as a Nation can not limit our legislation to the village from which the gentleman from North Dakota comes [applause on the Democratic side], nor can we fix our theories of the world's commerce from the standpoint of village wisdom. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. LANGLEY. I understood the gentleman to say that the Republican Party had changed its position on the quantitative theory of money from what it was 15 years ago. Is that correct?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It certainly has.

Mr. LANGLEY. I wish to ask the gentleman whether he and his party have changed their position from what it was 15 years ago on the question of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky that the theory that we advanced 15 years ago has recently been adopted as correct by a Republican Senate committee. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I want to say this about these farm products. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS], in his carefully-prepared and able argument the other day, stated that the cost of living was not governed by a tariff wall, that the farmer did not get the benefit of the prices, but that the price was made by the middleman; and in order to sustain that position he asserted that an onion sometimes sold to the final consumer at a thousand per cent more than the farmer got for the onion when it left the farm. Now, that may be true as to onions. It may be true as to a few commodities, but I want to call your attention to one great commodity that goes on the table of every man, that is necessary to sustain the life of the Nation, and that is meat.

The difference between the wholesale price and the price to the consumer, as shown by the census figures in 50 cities, varies in different localities. In the North Atlantic States the increase above the wholesale price to the consumer is 31.4 per cent. In the South Central States it is as much as 54 per cent, but in 50 cities of the United States the average increased retail price to the consumer over the wholesale price is 38 per cent.

Does that sustain the argument of the gentleman that the wholesale price does not affect the value when it goes to the ultimate consumer? And the same thing is true in many other commodities.

I do not contend for a moment that the value of this treaty is in the fact that we are going to reduce the price of wheat

either in this country or in Canada; I believe, though, that we will make a more stable market in both countries. I believe that we will prevent, to a large extent, speculators and manipulators from cornering markets and at times forcing exorbitant prices upon the people of the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That may not be a good reason from the standpoint of you gentlemen who believe in protecting profits, but it is certainly a good reason from the standpoint of men on the Democratic side of the House who are opposed to any proposition that leads to monopoly or oppression. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

My friends, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] complains of the fact that the President of the United States sent this pact to Congress. Why, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and his colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee in the last Congress are responsible for its being here.

The President called Congress in extraordinary session two years ago to revise the tariff downward, not because he feared the people, but largely because certain large manufacturing interests were demanding changes that had become burdensome to them and the development of their foreign trade. The President was honest and ignorant; the standpatters were informed and cunning; the natural result followed, and they handed the President a "gold brick," that glittered without and was false metal within, when they induced him to sign the Payne-tariff bill.

But the complaining manufacturer was not to be put aside so easily; he knew the rates were still left as prohibitive as they were under the Dingley bill, and he wanted concessions made to advance his trade in foreign markets. They therefore agreed to give the President a "big stick," to be used for the manufacturer's benefit in the nature of the minimum and maximum provision of the Payne tariff law, whereby the rates provided in the bill were made the minimum rates and the maximum rates were an advance of 25 per cent ad valorem over the minimum rate and were to take effect at a later day if foreign nations did not make concessions in the interest of our foreign trade demanded by the President.

The end of the history is a short and sad one. The President went abroad with his "big stick," demanding concessions, and he came back without any material concessions and without the "big stick." Our stand-pat friends were advised that the coercion method would not work before they tried it. They knew France had made a failure of such a plan over two decades ago, but they could not put the tariff any higher than the Payne bill put it; they were unwilling to allow the President a chance to reduce it by making the Payne rates the maximum rate and authorizing the President to reduce it to a minimum rate. If they had done so, this legislation could have been avoided, and he could have probably accomplished his purpose in the main by conceding to Canada the minimum rates.

In the meantime the temper of the American people was such that the President dared not impose the maximum rate on Canadian products. So the President was forced to get out of the difficult position as best he could. The manner in which he did it was best told by the Hon. Mr. Fielding, Canadian minister of finance, when introducing the pending reciprocity agreement at Ottawa:

The President of the United States—

Says Mr. Fielding—

as one evidence of his sincere desire to avoid trouble with Canada, did us the honor of inviting a member of this Government to proceed to Albany to meet him and discuss the matter. \* \* \* It was not a question of putting on the tariff, but a question of taking it off, and I found the President of the United States was willing to take it off if we could give him some decent excuse to do so. \* \* \* We made a few changes, a few concessions of no earthly importance, but they served the purpose and gave Mr. Taft the excuse he desired to refrain from imposing the maximum tariff against Canada. Out of this negotiation grew the larger negotiation of a more recent date. We were invited then to take up the greater question of the reciprocal trade agreement.

Now, is not that pathetic, the straits these bad standpatters placed their President in because they did not know how to arrange a maximum and minimum tariff rate, or were they again deceiving the President? Perish the thought!

Mr. Fielding says:

It was not a question of putting on the tariff, but a question of taking it off, and I found the President of the United States was willing to take it off if he could be given an excuse to do so.

It was an outrage that any political party should put our great country in such a humiliating position in the eyes of the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the House, general debate is now closed, and the Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fresh meats: Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and all other fresh or refrigerated meats, excepting game, 1½ cents per pound.



Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the paragraph just read by striking out of lines 11 and 12 the words "1½ cents per pound."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, lines 11 and 12, strike out the words "1½ cents per pound."

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I will state frankly to the members of the committee that the purpose of offering this amendment and others which will follow, if they shall receive the support of the committee, is to strike out these products from the tariff list and to offer in their stead, when we reach that portion of the bill, an amendment placing meat and all meat products on the free list.

As I do not desire to speak at different times on this subject when the paragraphs are reached, I want to state my position. If there is one fundamental policy that ought to be adopted by the American Congress at this time, independent of politics, it should be a policy to curtail the power of the trusts, particularly those trusts which are, beyond dispute, in control of many of the common necessities of life. It is a matter of current history that the chief operations of the great trusts at this time apply to the food products of the people, those things that must enter into the consumption of practically every home.

That the Meat Trust is a combination, an unlawful monopoly, we only need to refer to the records of our own courts where the prominent members and officers of these combinations are at this time under indictment for overworking their opportunities to corner and monopolize the meat products between the time they leave the farm and reach the table of the consumers.

This agreement places the farmer on the free list, and then keeps a liberal protection for the miller, the packer, the tanner, and leather manufacturer, and for everybody that is organized to reap big profits between the farmer and the consumer. It is about as bad as it could be framed to give further advantage to the middleman, who does his business between the producer and the consumer. Those people are doing pretty well now. About the only additional boost we could give them would be a larger free-trade market in which to buy while still protecting them liberally in what they have to sell. This the proposed agreement will do.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I will.

Mr. GARRETT. The Payne-Aldrich bill provided for a duty of 1½ cents a pound on meat. Did the gentleman from South Dakota offer an amendment then to put meat on the free list? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I did not; but I will say that if it had been offered, the gentleman on the floor from South Dakota would have supported the amendment, if we had been compelled, as here, to put live cattle on the free list. He will support it here and now, and if you gentlemen will follow and sustain the products of the farm through the intermediate combinations that control prices to the consumer, and place the ultimate products of the farm free from the control of these monopolistic combinations I will support the amendment and support the reciprocity measure. Will the gentleman reciprocate and vote for the amendment that will give free food products to the consumer?

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield for an answer?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT. Within a few days there will be a bill before the House to put upon the free list beef, mutton, veal, lamb, pork, and so forth. I shall vote for it; will the gentleman? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. The gentleman has answered my question in a manner that would have done credit to a part of the country north of the place where the gentleman resides. He has answered my question by asking another. I asked him whether he would support the amendment in this particular bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if various amendments to be offered are to be followed by a discussion of this kind I shall object, if the purpose is to mutilate this bill and ultimately to defeat it in that manner.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania object?

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. I object.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the question of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] to the gentleman who

has just yielded the floor fully answers all that can be said on the subject. The gentleman tries by his amendment to put meat on the free list coming from Canada. We have a bill prepared and reported to this House to put meat on the free list coming from all the world [applause on the Democratic side], and the gentleman will not vote for it when it comes up, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Well, the gentleman may be surprised on that score.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I hope I will be. I shall welcome the gentleman with open arms.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. There are several surprises that may be due the gentleman.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this. I can say, on the authority of the President of the United States, that the only reason that meat is not on the free list in this bill is because the commissioners of the Dominion of Canada refused to allow it to be placed there. If you adopt the amendment offered, you will defeat the bill.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to have him explain why.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Because it has got to go back, if it is changed, to the commissioners for a renegotiation, and that will destroy it at the present time and possibly for all time to come.

Mr. LENROOT. Has the gentleman read the Canadian bill? If he has, he will not make that statement.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have read the Canadian bill, and the gentleman and I evidently differ in our construction of it.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if he understands that this pact prevents the Government of the United States from declaring free trade in meats between Canada and this country?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It does at the present time, as far as the agreement goes now. We have a third section added to the bill that I hope will ultimately lead to very much freer trade with Canada than this bill contains now. But I want to say once for all, the purpose of offering amendments to this bill is to defeat it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] No man on this side of the House need fear that his vote will be misunderstood when he votes against amendments to this bill, no matter in what form they may come or from what source.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman did not understand the purport of the inquiry of the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Possibly not.

Mr. GARRETT. He asked if this treaty would prevent putting meats on the free list from Canada; that is to say, if it would defeat the purpose of the bill that is to come hereafter.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, not at all. I did not understand the gentleman's proposition. Of course, the second bill will be passed if it becomes a law after this is signed.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I would like to know what obligation we have with Canada in connection with this particular legislation that would deprive us, in honor and comity between nations, from amending this pact or legislation so as to place meat on the free list in this bill, which would not be of like force if on to-morrow we seek to accomplish the same thing by another bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Why, it is very simple. This is in the reciprocal free list. If we change it here we force Canada to put meat on the free list herself, which she declines to do, and we will destroy the pact; but when this is adopted, if a Republican Senate will adopt and pass a Democratic bill, we will put meat on the free list from all the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I move to close debate on this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that debate on this paragraph be now closed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And all amendments thereto.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion of the gentleman from Alabama is not debatable. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LENROOT) there were—ayes 125, noes 60.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk began the reading of the next paragraph.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment, which I desire to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not understand the gentleman from Nebraska had an amendment to offer.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend in line 12, page 1, by striking out the word "pound" and inserting in lieu thereof "100 pounds."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 12, strike out the word "pound" and insert in lieu thereof the words "100 pounds."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I moved to close debate upon the paragraph and all amendment thereto, but I do not wish to cut off the gentleman from Nebraska.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from Alabama to move to cut off debate on the pending amendment, but if the Chair is in error debate is closed on all amendments.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska may have five minutes in which to discuss his amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. I understood the Chairman in stating the motion to state that the motion was to close debate upon the paragraph, and the Chairman, as I understood it, did not say "all amendments thereto."

The CHAIRMAN. To be frank with the gentleman, the Chair's impression was that the motion of the gentleman from Alabama was to close debate on the amendment, but if the action of the House was to close debate on the paragraph and all amendments, why—

Mr. MANN. But the House votes on the motion as stated by the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Exactly; but the RECORD will show how the question was put to the committee, and that controls the committee.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will not take up the time of the committee—

Mr. KENDALL. It ought not to be done by unanimous consent, but the gentleman ought to have the time as a matter of right.

Mr. NORRIS. I am willing, Mr. Chairman, to take the Chairman's word for it. If he so stated the motion, I did not understand the motion made or hear it stated that way, but I may be mistaken, being so far back in the Hall. If the Chair says that he stated the motion to include all amendments thereto, I will admit that the Chair has the right—

The CHAIRMAN. The RECORD itself will disclose the actual fact, and in the absence of that the Chair, without objection, will recognize the gentleman from Nebraska to discuss the amendment he has just offered.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, if adopted, would in effect put the items included in the paragraph here, "Fresh meats: Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and all other fresh or refrigerated meats excepting game" on the free list. It will reduce the tariff to such a low amount that it would practically be free. I want briefly to reply to what the gentleman from Alabama has said in regard to the proposed amendments to this bill. I want to say to the gentleman and that side of the House that if this bill could be amended in certain respects, so as to make it, as I believe it would be then made, just and fair to the men and the classes from whom you take all the protection they now have, I would be willing to support the bill and vote for it. I want to say to the gentleman that he certainly must have misunderstood this bill when he says the adoption of such an amendment would defeat the so-called agreement with Canada. The agreement, or the bill, says we shall charge on the meats mentioned in this paragraph a rate of duty at 1½ cents per pound. Why can Canada object and why under heaven should she have any reason to object if, instead of charging her 1½ cents per pound, we said to Canada, "We will not charge you anything; you can bring it in free." There can be no reason given why any item named in the bill that is included in the imports coming from Canada should not be lowered or made absolutely free. There is no objection and there can be none. I know that the gentleman said that he is going to follow this bill by another one that will put these particular articles on the free list, but in order to make that sure and get the relief that he professes he wants to get by

this bill—because, as he himself intimated, there is no assurance that the bill in which he intends to put that item will become a law [applause on the Republican side]—then he should favor this amendment. You compel the farmer to sell his product on a free-trade market, but protect the Beef Trust as soon as it gets possession of the farmer's steers. This amendment will put the Beef Trust on the same level, and it may give the consumer of meats some benefit, a thing he does not get as the bill stands.

So, if we run no risk, why not put those items in this bill that everybody admits and understands is going to be placed upon the statute books? I offer the amendment in the best of faith. I would be willing, as I said, if the bill were sufficiently amended along these lines, to support it and to vote for it, as the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN] said he would. But, if you go on the theory that by caucus action you are going to control a majority of this House on matters of legislation and give to your fellows the simple promise that you are going to give us relief in a different bill which you do not believe yourselves is going to be enacted into law, it seems to me that you are not acting wisely, at least.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired. [Cries of "Vote!"] The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bacon and hams, not in tins or jars, 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the words "1½ cents per pound."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "1½ cents per pound."

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I may say to the members of this committee that it is not my habit to take up the time of the House by offering amendments for the purpose of delay, and if I am not interrupted in these five minutes I can say all I desire to say on this subject. It is to my mind so vital if this legislation is to be of any benefit to the people that I think one or two minutes should be given to this particular phase of the question before we pass to a final vote.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. If the gentleman will assure me that if I have to have a little more time it will not be objected to.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Of course I can not give that assurance. If the amendment that the gentleman is proposing, to put articles on the free list, is adopted, will he vote for this bill?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Yes; I will, if the gentleman will aid me in putting them on this bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not in this bill, but in the other bill.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Is there any probability of that bill becoming a law?

Mr. FITZGERALD. From the complexion of the Senate, controlled by the gentleman's party and the way they have acted in the past, I will say no.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this colloquy has disclosed the real purpose of the Democracy in this matter. They are willing to vote to cripple the trusts in a proposition and upon a bill that they themselves know has no chance of passing, but they are not willing to come forward and do it in a bill that may pass. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of this committee to a fact that, so far as I have observed, has not been called to the attention of the committee at all. The Canadian treaty that went into effect in 1854 not only provided that cattle should go on the free list, but that all meat products should go there; not only that wheat should go on the free list, but that all flour and products of grain should go on the free list; not only that hides should go on the free list, but that products of leather should go on the free list. We are here proposing to give to the trusts of this country an advantage which they very much desire but do not need. We are not striking at a single trust in this legislation, except the Print Paper Trust. We are fortifying the powers of the Meat Trust, of the Cereal Trust, of the Leather Trust, of the Flour Trust, and of the Barley Trust by assuring them of a free-trade market in which to buy their products and protecting them by a high-tariff wall against selling their products to the American people. I would like to see the gentleman display a loyalty as great as his frankness and agree with his colleagues to vote for a measure that is



likely to become a law in order that we may give real relief. What will be the operation of this bill? Let us see. It will probably reduce the price of wheat in this country something like 10 cents a bushel, from the best statistics. How many bushels are there in a barrel of flour? Practically four and one-half.

The wheat that goes into a barrel of flour after this bill passes will probably cost the miller about 50 cents less by reason of this agreement—4½ bushels, at a reduction of 10 cents per bushel. And, with remarkable cleverness, exactly 50 cents per barrel of flour is given to protect the millers of Minneapolis when they sell it to the American consumer. No reduction of the price of flour is likely to result, therefore, from this legislation.

It is proposed to put cattle upon the free list, but protect the packer's fresh meat at \$1.25 per hundred pounds. The packer will buy the farmer's 1,000-pound steer from Canada free of tariff duty. The steer will make, approximately, 650 pounds of fresh beef, upon which the packer is at once protected to the amount of \$8.12½, which is a larger profit than the American farmer has made on a like steer after three years of care and expenditure. This \$8.12½ protection to the packer on the meat is but little less than the present tariff duty on the live steer. There is little probability, therefore, that any reduction in the price of cattle will filter through to the ultimate consumer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. COVINGTON. Regular order!

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the hypocrisy of gentlemen on that side of the House is very apparent. They pretend that they wish to protect the American consumer from the operations of the Beef Trust, and yet they are now engaged in a performance which, even if successful, would bring no relief whatever to the American people from the exactions of the Beef Trust. Canada refuses to put meats on the free list because Canada is afraid that the Canadian consumer would be placed at the mercy of the Beef Trust of this country if American beef was allowed to go free of duty into Canada. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him for a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Just one moment. The one thing that will bring relief to the American people will be to put on the free list fresh meat coming from every country of the civilized world, so as to permit the importation of meat from Australia, the South American countries, and from every other great meat-producing country in the world, in order to have effective competition with the Beef Trust. But, Mr. Chairman, with an ingenuity for which gentlemen on that side of the House are famous, they pretend to be endeavoring to give relief to the American people by demanding that beef be allowed to come into this country from Canada free when all Canada and everyone else knows that no beef would come here if Canadian beef were put on the free list, but that the Beef Trust would go into Canada and take charge of that industry there, if it had a free market in Canada, and still hold the American market.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I will ask the gentleman, Has Canada any objection to the importation of meat from Canada to this country free?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is what I am trying to make very clear. Canada knows that no beef will come into this country, no matter what the tariff rate from Canada is, and inasmuch as this is a reciprocal agreement, the duties and rates are the same, whether articles come from one country or the other.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] both voted against this reciprocity agreement in the last Congress when it was pending in the House. It may be that some gentlemen have heard them raising their voices in favor of free meats when the Payne-Aldrich bill was under consideration here, or under consideration in another body, but my recollection does not bring to mind the figure of the gentleman from South Dakota discussing that question or urging it upon the Members of this House. The attempts to amend this bill are, in my opinion, made for but one purpose, and that is to arouse so much antagonism against this agreement in Canada and to create so much distrust and opposition there against it that, while it will not be beaten in the United States, it will fail to receive the approval of the Canadian Parliament. That, in my opinion, is the purpose of the gentlemen on that side who are endeavoring to amend this

measure and attempting to persuade Members of this House that in so doing they are seeking to relieve the American people from the high prices that are exacted for food products.

If the gentleman from South Dakota desires to help in relieving the people of this country from the exactions of the Beef Trust, let him hold his soul in patience and vote for the free-list bill that will be offered here, and which will provide for the free importation of meat, so that the Beef Trust will no longer be in a position to extract money unjustly from the American people.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I would say to the gentleman, Yes, I will vote for that bill; but the gentleman may rest assured that it will not pass.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

Mr. JAMES. Why will it not pass? Will the gentleman's party defeat it in the Senate?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from New York, if the proposed bill does not become a law, will this other proposition become effective?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not expressing my opinion as to whether that measure will become a law in the future, because my experience with the party with which the gentleman has so long been associated leads me to believe that nothing but a supernatural agency would convert certain gentlemen in his party to the policy of serving the interests of the people, and I do not look for that in the immediate future. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to ask the gentleman from New York, Why not permit a vote to be taken on amendments to this measure in order to avoid that very contingency, no matter from what side it may come, whether from my party or from his party? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, the gentleman's suggestion is plausible, but the applause which he receives comes from those who have been opposing this bill during this debate.

Mr. DALZIELL. Does the gentleman not know that there are already two amendments on this bill as it came originally from the State Department?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes, I do; and I know that the administration of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania has been a wheel horse for some years assured this side of the House that those amendments will not jeopardize the enactment or approval of this law, either here or in Canada; and the criticism of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN] should have been made in the White House and not in the House of Representatives. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I shall be glad to be recognized, just to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. CANNON. I rise to oppose the amendment. I have heard the thunders roar before.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is not in order. Debate on this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. CANNON. Then I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] counsel that no amendment shall be offered to this bill, for the reason that they say the bill covers the pact or agreement made by the President of the United States with the Canadian commissioners, and that this is an effort to vitalize that pact or agreement by legislation, and that it can not be amended without the permission of Canada, that Canada would not consent, and that the agreement would fail. Now, I want to ask the gentleman what assurance he has that, in section 2 of this bill, page 23—

Pulp wood, mechanically ground—

And so forth, which is not according to the pact or agreement, but an amendment to that agreement, will be accepted?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield to allow me to state the assurance we have?

Mr. CANNON. I yield for a question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. My understanding of the history of that amendment is that at the request of the executive department of the Government, either directly or indirectly, that particular

amendment to section 2 was prepared by the distinguished gentleman who now heads the minority of this House, and assurances were received from the Executive, after consultation with the representatives of the Canadian Government, that this amendment would not jeopardize the pact, but would be accepted by Canada. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. When gentlemen get through applauding I will try to take the remainder of my time without interruption. By what grapevine telegraph has that assurance been given? In what public document does it appear? If you can amend the agreement in one respect, why can you not do so in another? It is proposed to amend it in section 2, and if that amendment is adopted the pact is broken, unless Canada accepts the amendment. [Laughter.] I will discuss section 2 when we come to it. I think I know why you amend section 2. You have not stated the reason. I will ask you to state it later; but I think it is a very thin argument to make in the American House of Representatives, which originates revenue bills—except this one [laughter]—that the pending bill can not be amended because Canada will not have it. Great heavens! Let us bring Canada down here and surrender the Hall of the House to her. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment of the gentleman from Illinois will be withdrawn. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota.

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Canned meats and canned poultry, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend line 6 by striking out "twenty" and inserting "one."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, in line 6, strike out "twenty" and insert "one."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, the Democratic majority are in desperate straits. [Derisive laughter on the Democratic side.] I say the Democratic majority are in desperate straits indeed when the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] feel forced to resort to the arguments they have made upon the preceding amendments. The gentleman from Alabama stated first that if this amendment was adopted the bill would have to go back to the Canadian Parliament. If the gentleman had examined the Canadian bill carefully, as a lawyer, he would never have made that statement, for I have too much confidence in his fairness to this House to believe that he would intentionally have misled it.

Day before yesterday I read a portion of the Canadian bill into the Record. I challenged then any lawyer in this Chamber to rise and say that putting a free list of imports into this country would affect that bill in the slightest degree. I renew that challenge now. The gentleman from Alabama next said that if we adopted this amendment that this was reciprocal, and that we would have to make the Canadian side of the bill the same. I want to say that if the gentleman had read his own bill carefully he would not have made that statement, because this does not purport to be reciprocal in any degree, for the proviso is as follows:

*Provided, That the duties above enumerated shall take effect whenever the President of the United States shall have satisfactory evidence and shall make proclamation that on the articles hereinafter enumerated, the growth, product, or manufacture of the United States, or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the Islands of Guam and Tutuila), when imported therefrom into the Dominion of Canada, duties not in excess of the following are imposed, namely:*

We do not propose to touch the Canadian side of the agreement upon these duties. [Applause on the Republican side.] Gentlemen of the majority, you are trying to deceive the country this afternoon in your action of to-day. [Applause on the Republican side.] There is no reason, if you are acting in good faith in desiring to lower duties, why you should not vote for these amendments, and the reason you are not is because you do not want to legislate for the country. You propose a little later to support a bill which you believe will be vetoed and not become a law. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. THAYER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. THAYER. I would like to ask the gentleman whether the same solicitude for the Canadian people which moved him and his associates to offer these amendments is the same solicitude which moves them to vote against this reciprocity treaty with Canada? [Applause.]

Mr. LENROOT. I want to say to the gentleman that I am going to vote for the amendments, every one of them, and I am going to vote for the free list, although without having any confidence that we shall secure the legislation. But if we would adopt these amendments, we would have legislation of some benefit to the consumers of the country, instead of only supposed political issues for you. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, just for a moment I want to engage in a little uncovering of motives. I saw the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota to put meat on the free list. When I saw that I began to think of his record in the past. I think I have heard him say that he was for the free admission of nothing into America. He wanted the tariff wall so high that nothing could get over it. What reason has the gentleman for wishing to inject into this reciprocity bill these free-list measures? It must be along these lines that they know that every man who conscientiously will support one of these amendments putting certain items on the free list in this bill will likewise vote for it on the free list introduced by the gentleman from Alabama and now pending here, and they know that every Member who is at heart opposed to this bill will vote to put these items on the free list in this bill and then vote to defeat the bill. If they get these items on this bill here, they will kill this bill in the Senate, or else, if there are enough Members in the House and Senate honestly in favor of the free items now urged by them, then our free-list bill will go through the Senate. You can not be for the free-list items in this bill and against them in the other. And Senators in the other end of the Capitol can not be for free items in this bill and against them in the next bill on the calendar. If this bill will pass the Senate with the free-list items in it, so will the free-list bill introduced by the gentleman from Alabama. When the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] voted to put meat on the free list in this bill, I looked with suspicion upon the motives of the whole party back of him. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] may be honest and sincere, but when he sees the company he is moving with he ought to know he is blind.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do so for the purpose of stating my reasons for opposing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. There seems to be some question as to the exact effect of that amendment, together with the amendments offered by the gentleman from Nebraska and the gentleman from South Dakota. These gentlemen say that the effect of the adoption of their amendments would be merely to change the duty imposed by this bill upon Canadian products and not change the duty imposed by Canada upon the American products. Now, if that is true, Mr. Chairman, the effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is simply that canned meats and poultry coming from Canada into this country would be received at a duty of 1 per cent ad valorem, and the meats and poultry going from this country to Canada would be charged 20 per cent ad valorem. But the gentleman from Wisconsin says that Canada will not object to this; that Canada would be glad to have her canned poultry come in here at a less duty than she imposes on our product. Of course, that would be for the benefit of Canada. Of course, Canada would not object; but, Mr. Chairman, how about all the other countries of the world with whom we have the most-favored-nation clause in our treaties? The effect of this amendment would be simply this: We would be giving to Canada a preferential of 95 per cent which we accord to no other nation and for which Canada gives us no adequate consideration.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. If it be true that that would be giving Canada something for which we get no consideration, then is it not true that the bill unamended would have the same effect that the gentleman is afraid of, because we are giving to Canada something and getting nothing in return? [Laughter.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. On the contrary; in my view there is abundant consideration for this agreement on both sides just as it stands. Therefore, we must not by amending this bill give Canada much lower duties than she gives us on the same articles, so that some other foreign nation can say that we are discriminating in favor of Canada in that particular, giving Canada advantages which we do not accord to them.

Mr. NORRIS. The duties are not all the same.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I decline to yield further, Mr. Chairman. It is perfectly apparent that it is just as dangerous to the success of this bill to put Canadian products on the free list where Canada does not reduce her duty against us as to



reduce or raise other duties which we have reason to believe Canada would not accept. That is one other way of beating this bill. There are two ways of defeating the bill. One is to make an amendment which Canada will not agree to, and the other is to make an amendment which will violate the most-favored-nation clause with other nations. I am speaking, Mr. Chairman, as a Republican, and as one who is in favor of this bill as it stands. I propose to vote against any amendment offered for whatever purpose which may result fatally to this bill. I am content in this matter to follow the President of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against every amendment proposed to this bill, including even the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio to strike out the last word, now pending.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will withdraw that pro forma amendment.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; I am speaking in opposition to it, and the gentleman can not withdraw it. I do not take this view under the mistaken apprehension that it is not within the power of Congress to amend the bill without in any way affecting the agreement entered into by the two countries. [Applause.] I do not disguise from myself the fact that it was wholly within the spirit and the letter of the agreement to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LEXROO], now pending, or any other amendment which reduces the rate of duty on articles coming from Canada into the United States without in any way affecting the rate of duty on articles coming from the United States into Canada. There are a number of items in this bill that are not at all reciprocal, a number of items in the bill in regard to articles coming from Canada into the United States that are not mentioned in the list of articles going from the United States into Canada. There are a number of articles mentioned in the list going from the United States to Canada that are not mentioned in the list of articles coming from Canada to the United States. For instance, we put a duty of only 10 cents a ton on iron ore coming from Canada into the United States, in consideration of Canada putting a duty of only one-half a cent a pound on unshelled peanuts and 1 cent a pound on shelled peanuts coming from the United States into Canada, because neither of those items is found in the corresponding list of the other country.

It would be quite within our power under the favored-nation clause, in my judgment, to admit meats free of duty coming from Canada into the United States in consideration of Canada admitting meats at a cent and a quarter a pound coming from the United States into Canada. It is quite within the province of the favored-nation clause and the agreement to do this, but it would not be good sense, in my judgment, and I shall vote against that amendment and other amendments. I appreciate the difficulties on the other side of the House in voting down these amendments which are in order, which would not invalidate the agreement, in my opinion.

I am in favor of carrying out the agreement and entering into reciprocal relations with Canada, but I appreciate the fact [applause] that while amendments might be made, they would result in defeat of the bill in the end.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MANN. In just a moment. My distinguished colleague from Illinois, distinguished in many ways, has stated that section 2 of the bill relating to pulp and paper was not in accordance with the agreement. With what little knowledge I have been able to gain, after partly, if not at least helping in, preparing the amendment or the section in the bill and in part the provision in the agreement, I am prepared to say that section 2 of the bill to the letter carries out the agreement entered into between the two executives and does not depart in the slightest degree from the terms of the agreement. [Applause.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words—

The CHAIRMAN. Debate has been exhausted; debate is now proceeding by unanimous consent and— [Cries of "Regular order!"] Regular order is demanded. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Lard and compounds thereof, cottolene and cotton stearine, and animal stearine, 1½ cents per pound.

Mr. BARTHOLOTT. Mr. Chairman, having had no time during general debate, I avail myself of the privilege of offering the pro forma amendment to strike out the last word, for the purpose of reading or having read into the Record a poem on reciprocity composed by the poet laureate of the city of Wash-

ington, Col. John A. Joyce; and I may be pardoned for suggesting that our poets are not usually inspired by what is bad, but generally by what is good. I ask the Clerk to read it in my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### RECIPROCITY.

Reciprocity is good  
In the field and farm and wood  
To intertwine our brotherhood.

Reciprocity is best  
For each honest, loving guest,  
From the East unto the West.

Reciprocity is grand  
To tie us to a brother land,  
Equality of heart and hand.

Reciprocity is wise,  
Without greed or base disguise,  
And no secret, liquid lies.

Reciprocity is love,  
Gentle as a cooling dove,  
Born from glorious climes above.

Reciprocity to feel,  
In our woe or in our weal,  
That we get a strong, square deal.

Reciprocity, fore and aft,  
With all nations, scoring graft,  
Through the voice of big Bill Taft!

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from Missouri a question. The gentleman states the verses are signed by John A. Joyce. Does that settle the question between John A. Joyce and Ella Wheeler Wilcox as to who is the author of "Laugh and the world laughs with you"? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BARTHOLOTT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Egg yolk, egg albumen, and blood albumen, 7½ per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and all other fresh or refrigerated meats excepting game; bacon and hams, not in tins or jars; meats of all kinds, dried, smoked, salted, in brine, or prepared or preserved in any manner; canned meats and canned poultry; extract of meat, fluid or not; lard and compounds thereof; cottolene and cotton stearine, and animal stearine; tallow; egg yolk, egg albumen and blood albumen, the growth, product, or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada, shall be imported therefrom into the United States free of duty.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is obnoxious to paragraph 3 of Rule XXI with which, perhaps, the gentleman is not familiar.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Vermont desire to be heard?

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. I do not if the gentleman insists upon his point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We can not waste time on these frivolous amendments.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The amendment undertakes to put upon the free list certain articles being imported from the Dominion of Canada. The paragraph just read is part of the section relating to the dutiable list of articles imported into the United States from the Dominion of Canada, and the amendment is not germane to it. The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Barley malt, 45 cents per 100 pounds.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, there are two distinctive, fundamental principles of government, upon the one or the other of which all governments are founded and rest. These principles are directly the opposites of each other. In one the theory of concentration of power and authority prevails, and in the other the diffusion of the power and authority of government prevails. In the monarchy the sovereignty of government is concentrated largely in the hands of a few, while in the democracy the sovereignty of government is disseminated among the masses of the people, who exercise the power and control of government. Where power is vested in a few the theory prevails that the few possess and are entitled to have superior privileges and benefits and that the authority of government can rightfully be used to foster and benefit the business and the welfare of the favored few. In the democracy the cherished idea of equal rights and exact justice to all and special privileges

to none pervades and should dominate its institutions of government and the legislation of the country.

There are also two theories of taxation and two distinctive lines of public policy along which the taxing power is exercised. The Democratic Party teaches and boldly asserts that the taxing power of the Government—that power which the Government has and exercises to take the private property of the individual citizen—can only be exercised rightfully for the purpose of raising revenue for governmental purposes to maintain the Government honestly and properly administered, and that when this purpose is accomplished the taxing power of the Government ceases; but the Republican Party disputes this limitation of the taxing power and asserts that the Government has the right and should exercise the taxing power for purposes other than the governmental purpose of raising an adequate revenue to maintain the Government. In keeping with these assertions, for more than 40 years the Republican Party has exercised the taxing power for purposes other than revenue purposes. It boldly asserts that the Government has not only the authority, but that it should exercise the taxing power for the purpose of protection.

Let us clearly understand and illustrate what the doctrine of protection means and how it operates.

For illustration, we will say that in New York, or New Jersey, or Ohio, or Tennessee, or elsewhere in the States of the Union, certain individuals are engaged in business, and the profits realized are not as large as they think they are entitled to, and in order to increase their profits it is proposed, under the theory of protection, to exercise and use the taxing power of the Government so as to require the purchasers and consumers of their goods to pay a larger price and yield a larger profit. For instance, we will say that an importer of hats can buy them abroad at such a price that they can be sold to the consumer at a reasonable profit at \$1 each. When he arrives at the port of entry he is met by a customs officer who informs me that before he can enter the goods into this country he must pay a certain duty, and he inquires why and for what purpose. A Democrat tells him that he is to receive the benefits of the markets of our country and that it is just and proper that he should pay a reasonable amount toward raising the revenue necessary to properly maintain the Government; but a Republican says to him that independently of the question of revenue for governmental purposes he must pay a tax for the sake of protecting and fostering the business of the manufacturers of hats in New York or Tennessee, and that these manufacturers desire to sell their hats at a dollar and a half each, and in order to enable them to do so a duty will be levied upon his hats to force him to sell his hats at a dollar and a half each, and thereby enable the home man to exact a larger price and larger profit from his customers. This simple illustration brings out forcefully the difference in principle between the exercise of the taxing power for revenue purposes under the Democratic theory of government and the exercise of the taxing power for the purposes of protection under the Republican theory of government. It will be borne in mind that the increased price of the hat made here does not inure to the benefit of the revenue of the Treasury, but goes wholly into the business of the private manufacturer, and when it is further remembered that for every imported article upon which the Government receives revenue there are at least 10 times as many homemade articles, it is easy to understand how the taxing power of the Government is used to levy tribute under the Republican policy upon the labor and toll and the production of the masses of the people for the purpose of building up the fortunes of a favored few; and when we enlarge this illustration to embrace the vast number of articles used in this country, amounting to billions of dollars each year, we can have some idea of the enormous tribute paid by the masses of the people under this perverted use and exercise of the taxing power, and which goes as tribute into the coffers of the protected classes, and we can get a further insight into the methods by which the colossal fortunes have been piled up in this country.

I wish also to call attention to the fact that when one industry is protected every other industry demands similar protection, and the individuals receiving these benefits bind themselves together and cooperate under a community of interest, not only for the maintenance of their own favored position, but to encourage others to join with them and thereby strengthen and insure the continuance of the policy of protection by which they fatten and grow rich; and thus it is—the political poison spreads, and one artificial condition succeeds another until the natural laws of supply and demand as regulators of trade and commerce are largely destroyed and supplanted by the agreement of combinations formed in restraint of trade; and thus it

is that trusts spring up and prosper in every department of business which receives this protection, and the great mass of the people are continually paying tribute to these trusts and combines through the wrongful exercise of the taxing power of the Government. The history of tariff legislation in this country has been that the tariff taxes have continued to grow higher and higher, and the stronger and richer the enterprises become which receive the benefit of tariff protection, the more insistent they become that it shall be perpetually continued and maintained at a higher rate. Right economic laws can not be violated continually with impunity, and we have to-day, and have had for years, many illustrations of wrongs and grievances done to the American people because of these abuses of the taxing power and using the Government as an agency to take the money of some of the citizens for the benefit of others. Conditions became so intolerable and public sentiment became so incensed that the mass of the people at the last election revolted against this policy and in no uncertain terms have demanded a return to a proper and rightful exercise and use of the taxing power of the Government, and have commissioned the Democratic Party to discharge this trust, and the President of the United States, realizing the demand of the people that the tariff tax shall be lowered and the wrongs righted, has submitted for the consideration of the Congress the Canadian reciprocity treaty, and it is my purpose to state my position with reference to the pending legislation. Some of my people have requested me to vote against Canadian reciprocity legislation, and, as I was unable to do so, and desire to place before them and this body some of the reasons why I was unable to do so, I shall use as a part of my remarks my letter in reply to their petition, which letter is as follows:

"I am in receipt of your letter of the 14th instant inclosing a petition bearing 261 names asking me to work and vote against the passage of the pending Canadian reciprocity treaty legislation.

"In reply I beg to say that I am always glad to have an expression from all of my constituents of their views on pending legislation and always give careful and conscientious consideration to their views and wishes. I fully realize the high character of the signers to the petition, and that very many of them are my warm personal friends.

"I wish to observe that I am now and have all my life been interested in farming and everything I have is invested therein, and my son, just starting in life, has chosen farming as his life work, and I am sure that you will appreciate that from every standpoint I am deeply interested in the welfare and prosperity of the farmers, and that it is my desire to do all I can to promote and advance their interests and success. However, it is my mature judgment, after much consideration, that you and they are unnecessarily agitated over the supposed results of this legislation, and I will give you some of the reasons which move me to pursue the course which I do. And, as it is impossible for me to write personally to each of the signers of the petition, I shall take the liberty of publishing this letter to you as my reply to each of them.

"First. During the last session of Congress the Democrats met in caucus and gave full consideration to this legislation, and by an overwhelming vote adopted it and made it a Democratic measure. During the present session of the newly elected Congress another caucus was held and the matter again considered, and again, by an overwhelming vote, was made and declared to be a Democratic measure. I may add that it has the support and indorsement of all the Democratic leaders of the country. Now, if I should work and vote against the bill I would not in the least change the result of anyone's vote other than my own. But I would, by so doing, subject myself to exclusion from the future caucuses of the party and from participation in its future councils, and I would be placed in a position of political alignment with the high protective tariff wing of the Republican Party. I feel confident that it is not the desire that I should be placed in this position.

"Second. For time out of mind the Democratic Party has declared that the tariff on farm products in this country was of no advantage to the farmers of the country, and did not affect in any way the price of farm products. The Democratic Party has uniformly declared that as this country was a large exporter of farm products which were sold in open market competition of the world that the price of farm products in this country was controlled and governed by the price of the surplus sold abroad. This is a fundamental, economic proposition, which, it appears to me, will not be controverted. For more than 25 years throughout my district and in other places of the State and in other States I have advocated this political doctrine and have declared for these political principles and



policies of tariff legislation, and, so far as I have been able to observe, they have always met the cordial and enthusiastic support and indorsement of the Democrats of all vocations of life. The Democratic Party has repeatedly declared—and so have I—that the tariff on farm products was levied for the purpose of attempting to justify what we consider excessively high duties upon other articles which are affected in price by the tariff. Now, I am asked to reverse this position and, by my vote, assert that the tariff on farm products does affect and control prices, and thereby to approve and indorse the political teachings of the Republican Party. I feel confident that, upon reflection, I will not be asked or expected to do this. When I call your attention to the fact that during the last 10 years we exported and sold abroad \$12,239,651 bushels of wheat and, in addition, 144,945,543 barrels of flour, or, if I call your attention to the fact that during the same time we exported and sold abroad \$1,975,278,025 worth of breadstuffs, made of farm products, you will at once realize not only the vast magnitude and importance of our foreign trade to the farmers, but you will realize that the prices of these sales abroad fix absolutely the prices of farm products at home.

"Third. But let us deal especially with Canada. During the last five years ending June 30 last, in goods of all kinds—

We sold in Canada	\$886,417,376
Canada sold to us	393,913,673
Difference in our favor	492,503,703

"These figures show that Canada is a good country for us to trade with. Any country which buys from us more than it sells to us is a good country to trade with. No tariff wall should stand between us and such a country.

Horses:	
We sold in Canada	\$14,172,075
Canada sold to us	2,549,201
Difference in our favor	11,622,874

Cattle:	
We sold in Canada	1,578,179
Canada sold to us	1,193,796
Difference in our favor	384,383

Meat and dairy products:	
We sold in Canada	17,011,017
Canada sold to us	904,191
Difference in our favor	16,106,826

Breadstuffs:	
We sold in Canada	31,596,556
Canada sold to us	6,679,884
Difference in our favor	24,916,672

Corn:	
We sold in Canada	21,704,572
Canada sold to us	14,350
Difference in our favor	21,690,222

Wheat:	
We sold in Canada	4,442,307
Canada sold to us	766,254
Difference in our favor	3,676,053

"These official figures of our trade with Canada for the last five years show that she is a pretty good customer of the farmers of the United States, and that she is a country whose trade the farmers should cultivate and seek.

"It has been shown that a mixture of Canadian wheat and American wheat makes a higher and better grade of flour which commands a better price in the markets of the world than the flour made from either alone. Canada ships her surplus wheat to Liverpool and other foreign markets the same as we do, and the only difference is the question of freight rates, elevator facilities, etc. It is claimed by those who are competent to judge that if the United States could control through her own ports the shipment and export of Canadian wheat that it would enable this country to better regulate and control the price of wheat and steady its price and prevent corners and excessive fluctuations.

"Canada raises grass-fed cattle, but is unable to make corn-fed beef. The farmers of the United States have a surplus of corn and other cattle-feeding products, purchase the grass-fed Canadian cattle and corn-feed and sell them to a greater advantage, thereby utilizing their farm products to a better profit.

"Let me illustrate: The farmers of our section likewise raise corn and hay. They go into other States and purchase young mules and feed them and ship them, when grown and fattened, to other States at a nice profit, thereby making their farms more profitable and furnishing use and consumption for their corn and feedstuffs. Would our farmers think it a wise policy

to be compelled to pay a tax of \$25 or \$30 per head on each mule which they bring in from other States for feeding purposes and then when the mule is ready for shipment to be required to pay another \$25 or \$30 for the privilege of shipping and selling in another State? This forcibly illustrates the truth and correctness of the Democratic theory and policy of government which stands for larger trade and commercial peace and facilities, believing that there is profit both in buying and selling and that the prosperity of the country will be best promoted to all the people when there are few shackles upon trade and artificial conditions are destroyed, and competition and sale and purchase shall be afforded to all the people. I wish to say again that, in my opinion, which is reenforced and supported by the almost unanimous opinion of the Democrats in Congress, that the legislation which we propose will be of immense benefit to the farmers of the country, and I am confident that it will not injure the farmers of our section.

"In your letter you refer to the fact that there has been lately a decline in the price of farm products, and you charge it to the discussion of Canadian reciprocity. It is only necessary to call your attention to the fact that for time out of mind prices have risen and fallen. I might call your attention to the fact that on June 10, 1909, wheat was \$1.51; August 26, \$1.06; October 14, \$1.27; October 21, \$1.21; January 13, 1910, \$1.33; June 16, \$1.033; November 10, 96 cents. I could call your attention to the same fluctuations in the prices of corn, oats, and other products, showing greater fluctuations, and that Canadian reciprocity has nothing whatever to do with it.

"I may add that the caucus adopted and the House proposes to pass a companion bill placing on the free list all farm and agricultural implements and machinery and vehicles of every kind, leather, saddles and harness, boots and shoes, cotton bagging and ties, and many other articles which enter into the use and consumption of the farmers and the price of which is controlled more or less by the tariff; and I fail to see wherein the farmer has any cause of complaint at the program of legislation proposed by the Democratic Party.

"The doctrine of protection has been talked so long that its political poison has spread much throughout the country and artificial conditions of trade have been created, one artificial condition demanding the creation of another, and so on, until trade conditions have become so artificial and abnormal that trusts and combinations to control prices and restrain trade have infested the land; and the Democratic Party—true to the principles which it has always proclaimed with reference to the tariff—pledged itself to reduce the tariff, and should it not do so it would be false to its promises and betray the trust which the people reposed in it.

"After many years of difference and dispute and quarrels and defeat the Democrats finally united and won a glorious victory in the last congressional election. I believe in Democratic harmony and unity and cooperation. I deplore dissension and strife and division. Now is the time for unity of action and cooperation of purpose, and, all over the country, Democrats everywhere are demanding unity of action and that we shall subordinate our local and personal differences and stand united as a party. This I indorse, and such is my purpose."

Now, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I wish to say that I might have gone further into the details of our trade relations with Canada and reasons why I support this legislation, but it occurs to me that I have said enough to make my position plainly understood. Let the Government return to a rightful and proper use and exercise of the taxing power; let normal trade and commercial conditions be restored; let every man and every industry have a fair chance and unhampered opportunities in the struggles of life; let everyone receive and enjoy the full benefit of the results of his toil, industry, and capacity. Then will the country prosper and the blessings and benefits of labor and trade will be justly and more equitably distributed among the masses of the people and labor will receive and enjoy its reward. Discontent will largely disappear and happiness will bless the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Plows, tooth and disk harrows, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horse-rakes, cultivators; thrashing machines, including windstackers, baggers, weighers, and self-feeders therefor and finished parts thereof imported for repair of the foregoing, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer the following substitute. I wish to transfer from page 4 the amendment that I have sent to the Clerk's desk to line 4, on page 16. The paragraph that I offer the amendment to has been read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORDNEY:

Pages 4 and 5, strike out the paragraph beginning on line 21, page 4, and ending with line 2, page 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Plows, tooth and disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horse-drawn, cultivators, thrashing machines and cotton gins, farm wagons and farm carts, and all other agricultural implements of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in part, including repair parts."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. FORDNEY. I offer this as a substitute for the paragraph just read, and on that I would like to say a few words.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. I do not know what the amendment is.

Mr. HARDWICK. I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers a substitute—

Mr. FORDNEY. If the gentlemen will permit, I will explain to the committee what I mean by the substitute for that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan will suspend for a moment. The Chair will undertake to state the amendment offered by him. It is in lieu of lines 21, 22, 23, and 24, on page 4, and lines 1 and 2, on page 5, to insert the amendment read from the Clerk's desk as a substitute, and as to which a point of order has been reserved by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK].

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, in support of the substitute I wish to say that I am offering it for the reason that by the transfer of that paragraph to page 16, line 4, after the word "namely," it places the farm machinery described in that paragraph, or substitute, upon the free list coming from Canada into the United States, without affecting the duty on that class of goods going from his country into Canada.

Now, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] stated a while ago that his objection to a certain amendment was because it was not reciprocal. I would call his attention to section 2 of the bill and ask him where there is a word in the entire section or bill that is reciprocal between this country and Canada. Section 2 provides for letting into our market free of duty all print paper and pulp without asking anything in return for it. On the other hand, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said he would vote against all amendments to the bill, and that he would vote for the measure. Now, I want to offset that vote by saying that I will vote for any amendment that will destroy it.

The gentleman from Illinois said that he believed that all articles were reciprocal, for the reason that we were trading a ton of iron ore for peanuts. That is about the size of the measure, gentlemen. This bill is just about the size of trading a ton of iron ore, representing one of the great industries of this country, for peanuts from North Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, we are taking away from the farmer every vestige of protection on every article produced by him. And no man on that side of the House or this side of the House will contend, if he is fair in his argument, that there is a single thing in the substitute which I have offered that will in any way jeopardize the success of this measure except, my friends, that you are not willing to trade the farmer something for something that you are taking away from him.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does not the gentleman's amendment propose to increase the duty found in the bill under consideration at present?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not understand the gentleman.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I say, is not the effect of the gentleman's amendment to increase the duty found in the pending bill?

Mr. FORDNEY. If that is the effect, then I do not understand anything that I am talking about. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] But I will say to the gentleman that when I want to reach a conclusion in making up my own judgment I will not go to the gentleman from Brooklyn, or New York. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman would be much more fortunate if he did, rather than rely on himself and his own judgment. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. It is very fortunate for me, perhaps, that I am not a resident of Brooklyn. I have the honor to come from a better district—a district where Republicans grow, and where the farmers raise the products that feed the mouths of the people of Brooklyn. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

A MEMBER. Brooklyn no longer exists. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; but it is still on the map, and it belongs to the free-trade element. No man can come to Congress from the district represented by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] who does not express the sentiment expressed by him.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is right. They represent the will of the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, well, if my friend wants anything good to eat he will come to Michigan, and there he will get it. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the substitute.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. On that, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a word. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan shows how sincerely honest he is in trying to defeat this bill.

Mr. FORDNEY. That is what I said. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman from Michigan not only offers an amendment to change the terms of the bill, and so defeat it, but he proposes to raise the duty on the articles mentioned beyond the rates of the reciprocity duty and put those articles back at the old Payne-bill rate, because in offering his amendment he strikes out all rate of duty, and necessarily, as no rate of duty is mentioned, the articles would fall again under the terms on the Payne bill, which are above the rates of duty fixed in this bill, and that would of necessity defeat this bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman from Alabama allow me to reply to that suggestion?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. By transferring this paragraph from the protected list to the free list, does the gentleman mean to say that it will increase the duty on that article?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman gives no duty, and that would follow necessarily therefrom.

Mr. FORDNEY. If the gentleman will permit me, I will read the language prior to that. Will the gentleman permit me? I would like to set myself right on this. On page 15, line 24, the bill says:

That the articles mentioned in the following paragraphs, the growth, product, or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada, when imported therefrom into the United States or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the Islands of Guam and Tutuila), shall be exempt from duty, namely:

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand that the gentleman transfers it from the free list of this bill to the dutiable list.

Mr. FORDNEY. No. It is just the reverse. I transfer it from the dutiable list to the free list.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. This is the protected list, and the gentleman transfers the item from that without naming any duty, and in consequence the present rate of duty fixed by the Payne law would be effective.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, I beg to differ with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Laths, 10 cents per 1,000 pieces.

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 24, strike out the paragraph.

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Chairman, no one in this House can accuse me of lack of good faith in offering this amendment. No one can accuse me of offering this amendment for the purpose of defeating this bill. I voted for the bill before, and whether my amendment carries or not, I will vote for it again. [Applause.] I am offering the amendment in the interest of the people, not alone of my district, but of the entire country; because you have admitted upon the other side that if the amendment does not prevail now it will not be written into the law of this country during this session of Congress. This is your one opportunity to give our people absolute free lumber from Canada, and the question is whether or not you will embrace it. This bill goes far toward free trade in lumber with Canada, but it ought to go all the way.

I am one of the few gentlemen on this side who come from the Middle West who have been earnestly insisting upon a revision downward of the tariff law of this country who are now standing consistently for the same thing in this Congress that they stood for in the Sixty-first Congress.

There is a declaration made in the report of the minority on this bill, filed in the last Congress, signed by the gentleman from



Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] and by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], that this bill is an abandonment of the policy of protection. I am not in favor of the abandonment of the policy of protection as William McKinley defined it, as William H. Taft and other great leaders of my party define it, that it is the application of a duty equal to the difference of the cost of production at home and abroad, but I am in favor of abandoning protection as defined by Mr. DALZELL and Mr. FORDNEY, and I will not join with them in maintaining their kind of protection. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am sorry that I must differ with my friends from the Middle West, but in my judgment the consistent thing for us to do is not to rally round these gentlemen whose brand of protection we were so recently repudiating, but that instead we should stand with the President of the United States in this matter; because he is right and I am sure no Republican President ever did, and no Republican President ever will propose a measure to the Congress of the United States that is an abandonment of the policy of protection. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas yield?

Mr. MADISON. No; I have only five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MADISON. Illness prevented me from being here and discussing this bill as I wished and showing as best I could that this bill would not, as has been represented, be detrimental but beneficial to the agricultural classes of the Middle West. I have only five minutes now to discuss my amendment, and can not yield for interruptions. You gentlemen on the other side admit that your so-called "farmers' free-list" bill is not to become a law. You say it will be defeated in the Senate. Why are you passing it? In order that it may go to the Senate and be defeated—in order that you may cry that it was defeated by a Republican Senate? That is playing politics. That is not rising to the high standard to which you as a responsible party ought to rise, and when you are offered the opportunity to give the people of this country free lumber, as you can in this bill, and you refuse to do it, and pass through this House a bill including free lumber that you know will not pass the Senate, you are absolutely convicting yourselves in the eyes of the American people of the fault of inconsistency when you say you want to give them free lumber.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADISON. I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. COX of Indiana. Regular order!

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama renews the request that the gentleman from Kansas may proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADISON. My amendment is only the first of a number that I propose to offer. If you are honest in your desire for complete free lumber I feel sure you will vote this amendment through, and it will be the first one along the line of giving free lumber to the American people from Canada, a country that ranks third among the countries of the world in the quantity of its mature marketable timber.

Gentlemen, this bill is going to the other end of this Capitol, and the Senate of the United States will make the bill. As in the historic summer of 1909 this House will hurry through the bills it is now considering, send them to the Senate, and abdicate the responsibilities and duties placed upon it by the Constitution of the United States. The time will come when the representatives of the people of this country in this House will institute a contest to restore to the House the fundamental rights and privileges of the House. And I say, let it begin now and in the making of this bill. Let us assert our rights under the Constitution to originate bills to raise revenue, and let us make the bill as the gentlemen on the other side would make it, at least as to lumber, if they expressed their own desires. Why, nine out of every ten of you on the other side are in favor of free lumber, and yet you say your free-list bill will not go through, that this bill will go over to the Senate, and that the Senate will do with it as it pleases; and I say to you that, in all human probability, when it comes back here no man will recognize it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have a sincere regard for the gentleman from Kansas who has just taken his seat, but through some misapprehension or misconception he has made a statement that I must challenge. He states that we

propose to pass a bill through this House with the statement that we do not recognize that it has a chance to become a law. I deny that proposition. I tell you, sir, that the free-list bill that we have introduced in this House and propose to pass will become a law [applause on the Democratic side] or the men who sit in the United States Senate on the Republican side will vacate many a seat, and the President of the United States, if he does not sign it, will never be heard of again in the political history of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MADISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. MADISON. Was the gentleman in the House and did he hear the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; but I thought the gentleman's statement was facetious.

Mr. MADISON. Never was the gentleman from New York more serious.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But I will say to the gentleman that the bill puts on the free list agricultural implements, fencing wire, and salt and free lumber for your northern farmers. It puts on the free list free cotton bagging and free hides for the southern farmer. It puts on the free list free meat, free bread, and free salt for the people who live in the cities and who are crying for cheaper food products to reduce the cost of living. I say to you that when that bill arrives in the United States Senate if it is not acted upon, there will be a judgment day in the Republican side of the Senate, and if the President does not sign it, there will be a judgment day at the White House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman says that the farmers' free-list bill puts salt on the free list for the northern farmer. I live in a northern State and I can purchase a ton of salt for 75 cents in my home city.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That does not controvert the statement I made.

Mr. FORDNEY. A ton of salt will last you 100 years. [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman probably lives near a salt mine.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman spoke of a judgment day. I want to ask if that side is not a little more anxious for a judgment day than it is for legislation?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not at all; if there has been a Congress that has met in two decades that has shown itself willing to pass remedial legislation, not partisan legislation but remedial legislation in the interest of the people, this Congress has done so. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman has just said that he is desirous to pass remedial legislation and one of the items is free salt. I agree with him that that is proper, but is that other great necessity, sugar, on the free list?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is not.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. If not, why not?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. When we get to the sugar schedule we will legislate as to that matter, but it carries \$60,000,000 revenue, or thereabouts, and we can not abandon \$60,000,000 to run the Government until we provide something to take its place. [Applause.]

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the amendment. Gentlemen of the House, I do not desire to unnecessarily weary you. Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen on that side of the House will not be so tumultuous as they are now when they are put up against a proposition of voting on the real merits of the questions which are here before us to-day. Having occupied no time in general debate and being in favor of the amendment which my colleague says he intends to offer on the subject of lumber, I want to avail myself of a few minutes to express my views on the amendments to this bill.

Gentlemen of the House, I desire to assure you, and I hope you will believe me in that much, that I do so with the same good faith which has been expressed by my colleague. I believe that if you would avail yourself of your constitutional rights to write this bill here, you would write a bill which would give

justice to every American citizen under the flag, and which would give due credit to President Taft and his administration for negotiating this pact, which would preserve every jot and tittle of it as it was negotiated and would at the same time write into the policy of our Nation true reciprocity with our neighbor upon the north, and extend northward from the Gulf of Mexico to the frozen zones of the Hudson the great Zollverein of American trade which now exists in the Republic. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, you can not mention reciprocity with Canada in that part of this country west of the Allegheny Mountains unless you bring to mind immediately two things, and they are free lumber and free wheat. Gentlemen on the other side of the House, by insisting on this bill without amendment, give us free wheat but deny us free lumber. They say to us that they propose to put lumber on the free list, but in the same breath tell us they do not believe that bill will become a law. In other words, gentlemen, you say to us you have the courage to assail "the best tariff law ever made"—I believe I quote correctly—in the House of its patron saint and defender and expect to succeed. Not only that, but I doubt whether you will find Brutuses enough, Democratic Brutuses, who will be willing to stab their Caesar in the halls of the Senate. These are things upon which you will be doubted by the American people, and I say to you that if you are in favor now of free lumber and giving the western farmer a square deal you will vote for the propositions advocated by my colleague from Kansas [Mr. MADISON].

We are urged to vote for reciprocal relations with Canada on the grounds that our neighbors on the north are of the same blood, live under the same system of laws, and have the same industrial and commercial customs we have; but, sir, there can be but one reciprocity, founded on justice between two such peoples, and that is the reciprocity of free trade between those peoples. I am ready to vote for that. But even then it would be necessary to have a readjustment of other rates, tariff rates with which Canada has no concern, in order to do justice to farmers and others who have built up their businesses under the promise of the present tariff duties.

I am one of those who believe the danger which will come to the farmer under this bill has been greatly exaggerated, but this much must be admitted: The new policy, if adopted, means a readjustment of prices and investments, and consequent losses for the farmer. What do you offer as a compensation for these losses? No reduction in the tariff of any consequence from the same country on the things he buys, and free competition with a farmer living under the preferential tariffs granted by England to Canada.

In order to give you a Canadian view of the concessions made by this bill to the farmers on our side of the line, I desire to read a paragraph from Albert R. Carmen, a noted writer, of Montreal, in the National Review of last month. He says, speaking of the Canadian commissioners:

They were life-long leaders of the "school" which held tenaciously that some sort of a reciprocity between Canada and the United States ought to be possible and profitable without political menace. One of the first doctrines of this "school" has always been that we should strive to get free access for our farm products into the American market, and a companion for this has always been that we should get "free fish" for "free fishing." For the aforesaid free trade in farm products this "school" has usually been willing to grant some concessions on manufactured goods. With these points in their minds our ministers went to Washington; they were offered free trade in farm products without any concessions to speak of on manufactured goods and "free fish" without "free fishing."

We can imagine them—with their eyes solely on the business side of the subject—hardly able to believe their own good fortune.

The duties which these gentlemen insist shall follow the so-called Canadian pact give the American farmer only the same relief which the Canadian commissioners gave to us; they insist that they shall be the same; they amount to nothing to speak of.

If the Senate amends the bill, as I fully expect it to do, giving the West some measure of compensation for what you take away by this bill, or if you will write into it Mr. Madison's amendments and treat the Lumber Trust, the Steel Trust, and Harvester Trust as you treat the American farmer, I will vote for the bill, but I will not vote to take all away from the farmer and to take none of the high protective duties away from the trusts.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to elaborate upon this question. To my mind, Members of this House have been so thorough in their investigation and so lucid in their expositions that, after having listened with attention to the debate, I find myself restricted to very narrow limits, lest I annoy you with useless repetition.

Among other things that have impressed me is the non-partisan manner of the debate, which demonstrates that the gentlemen here present are true to the trust imposed in them by their constituents, that they have the promotion of the best

interests of the Nation as a whole at heart, and are here to enact legislation that will prove in their judgment the greatest good to the greatest number. However, it is only natural that some should differ in their conclusions regarding this measure, as it has a peculiar bearing upon the industries of every State of the Nation. Therefore, after weighing the merits of this bill, by which it must necessarily rise or fall, I have, after due study, taken the liberty to anticipate its probable effect upon the Nation at large and inevitably came to the conclusion that the enactment of reciprocity with Canada will prove of inestimable good and benefit.

An argument advanced by those who are opposed, and one upon which they have laid much pressure, may be stated briefly in this manner: That the barrier between Canada and the United States withdrawn, the large yield and extensive production of wheat in western Canada would prove a very formidable competitor with the production of wheat in the United States. Now, if I understand the arguments of the gentlemen from Minnesota correctly, they have maintained that the price of grain at Minneapolis is usually higher than the market prices of the world, transportation charges being considered. Now, usually there is a reason, and when we examine this proposition we find there is a very satisfactory explanation underlying this condition.

Ex-Gov. Lind, of Minnesota, while a Member of this House from that State, who has rendered great service to his State and to the Nation by his usefulness and statesmanship, speaking on tariff revision and Canadian reciprocity, stated on this floor, December 14, 1903, that:

I speak to my colleagues from the Northwest with full assurance that they will not deny the statement that the one factor that has contributed the most to make Minneapolis great is the development of her milling industries—through the development of that magnificent industry, the greatest in the world, and through the energy and foresight of our earlier business men, Charles Pillsbury and others, living and dead.

Minneapolis has become the greatest primary wheat market in the world. It makes every bushel of wheat raised in Minnesota and the Dakotas worth 2 to 6 cents a bushel more than it would be if our section were dependent upon Chicago or any other eastern point. Some of us know what has made Milwaukee famous. [Laughter.] All of us know what has made Minneapolis famous—"Pillsbury's Best." To maintain the standard of that magnificent bread and of all of our flour our mills must have a certain proportion of hard wheat; and, let me tell you confidentially, that wheat raised in Iowa and southern Minnesota and South Dakota is deteriorating somewhat from year to year, both in quantity and quality.

What has made Minneapolis flour great? What has given it a world-wide market? Is it not its superior quality and the faithful maintenance of that quality? But to maintain that standard we must have the stronger wheat, that wheat rich in gluten, which comes now only from the prairies of the Dakotas and from the northern part of our State, and in decreasing amount, but which we must obtain from Manitoba and from the other Canadian Provinces in the future.

If for possible present temporary gain you think that our millers should be prohibited from maintaining the quality of their goods and maintaining their world-wide market, where will your farmer neighbors and mine land when "Pillsbury's Best" has ceased to stand for what it now stands? You know, as I know, that our local wheat commands the price that it does only because our mills can as yet obtain enough of the stronger northern wheat to mix with it.

From this it may be inferred that the gentlemen from Minnesota who oppose this bill by reading the speech of the great son of Minnesota would be enlightened regarding the causes which produce the above-mentioned effect. In my own city of Omaha we have been laboring earnestly for several years and have established a great grain market. We have also gone into the milling business. Our winter wheat of Nebraska is rich and splendid in quality, and a large amount is shipped annually to Minneapolis to be mixed with the hard wheats of that vicinity in order that it may be made into a superior selling grade of white flour.

In the daily press of my city this week an important news item states that a large railroad project, on account of the belief that reciprocity with Canada will be enacted, with ample capital, has been formed to construct a railway north and south through Nebraska, the Dakotas, and into Canada. With the completion of this proposed railway the farmers of Nebraska will be enabled to have shipped from Canada the hard wheats, and thus the milling industries of Nebraska and the Middle West will be benefited and save the producers the necessity of paying the freight charge to the railroads to carry their wheat to Minneapolis, and instead of our farmers paying the freight the Canadians will ship to our mills and pay the freight.

It has been stated here that the prices for wheat are fixed in Liverpool. This is substantially true. However, to be accurate, it must be stated that this rule is subject to the convenience of grain gambling kings of the great cities who drive the prices up and down to suit their purposes. But it is a fact that the price of wheat is fixed by the world's supply. Every day there



is quoted in the grain markets the production or supply of wheat in the Argentine Republic, the supply in Europe, and the Black Sea ports. Therefore excepting in so far as local milling conditions in Minneapolis may have an effect locally the export supply of every wheat-producing nation is ruled by the demand at Liverpool.

At South Omaha, Nebr., there exists the third largest stock market in the world. The cattle feeders of Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, and adjoining States come to Omaha to purchase young cattle for their pastures and feed lots. With the barriers between the United States and Canada removed and the anticipated development of the railroad facilities, Canada will ship to our markets in the United States her stock—cattle and feeders—which will be bought by the cattle feeders of the corn-growing States and fattened for food purposes.

Considerable emphasis has been laid on the importations of sheep. The corn-growing States of the Middle West can feed and fatten all the sheep Canada can raise without injuring the cattle-raising industry of the country. Especially so when we know that the total number of sheep imported by Canada in 1909 was only 103,000, while at the South Omaha market as high as 67,000 have been marketed in a single day. This fact establishes to a certainty that the importation of sheep from Canada will not prove disastrous.

Some gentlemen have expressed concern over the effect this bill will have on flax production. As a young man in central and northern Iowa I observed that flax was usually sown on virgin soil; that is, on land just broken by the plow. This was because the roots of the flax rotted the soil and made it fit for wheat the following year. But after the soil became sufficiently adapted no more flax was sown, as it was too severe on the soil. For the same reason, in the developed regions of the Dakotas, flax seeding was used to great advantage, and it is now used in western Canada for the preparation of similar soils for farming purposes. Therefore, reciprocity with Canada will prove beneficial on account of the small amount of flax raised and the great amount needed in the United States.

The illustrious gentleman from Illinois pointed out on the map of Canada in his inimitable way the direction of the heat waves meandering around the southern edges of Hudson Bay and Mackenzie Basin. It seems that he evidently forgot to mention the cold waves that get busy in the neighborhood of Medicine Hat and Swift Current, in the wheat regions of Canada. Why, Mr. Chairman, in Nebraska when we look at the Government weather reports and see that the cold waves commence to do business at Medicine Hat we take it as a signal to drive our cattle and sheep to shelter and prepare ourselves for the coming ordeal. Medicine Hat is reputed as the most likely place from which a cold wave is likely to emanate, and when my friends from the Dakotas who oppose this bill hear that Medicine Hat has begun its deadly frost-biting work they hibernate or seek shelter, and often we do not hear from them for weeks.

Another thing that strikes me as being a principle of equity and justice is that we should be fair to our friends, our neighbors, and our relatives who have, with the courage characteristic of our people, crossed over into Canada to develop that country. And, Mr. Chairman, why should we not lend a helping hand to these large numbers of our brothers by means of this reciprocity with Canada, which without doubt will prove very serviceable in securing their permanent success and prosperity?

In conclusion, I wish to state that I have heard considerable about the effect the passage of this bill would have on different districts. Let me say that I represent one of the greatest manufacturing and agricultural districts of the Middle West, a district in which the cities of Omaha and South Omaha are located, whose census in 1910 totaled 124,096 and 26,000 people, respectively. Since coming to Washington I have not received a single protest from my district against this bill. Not a manufacturer, jobber, or farmer has requested me to vote against it. To show you that my district, which is inhabited by an intelligent and enterprising people, has sufficient manufacturing, agriculture, and so forth, to be interested, and to protest if they so desired, I will quote you a few statistics:

Omaha during 1910 sold \$132,262,000 worth of merchandise. The manufacturing products of Omaha and South Omaha amounted to \$200,968,541. Our bank clearings were \$842,000,000; real estate transfers, \$15,273,455; our live stock receipts were 6,132,451, divided into 1,223,533 head of cattle, 1,894,314 hogs, 2,984,870 sheep, and 29,734 horses and mules. In South Omaha we packed 3,746,454 head of live stock, comprising 798,950 cattle, 1,656,246 hogs, and 1,291,258 sheep.

The grain receipts of Omaha were 43,607,400 bushels, representing 9,212,400 bushels of wheat, 23,494,200 bushels of corn, and 10,023,600 bushels of oats.

We also have at Omaha one of the greatest butter markets in the world.

These figures show that with reciprocity with Canada and the proper railroad facilities there is a strong possibility for still greater development of the resources throughout the Middle West. It is only right and just that we should send our surplus products into Canada and receive in exchange commodities which we can use to good advantage. Thus the Great West will become an empire of richness whose greatness can not be estimated.

The farming lands in my district, with these developments, are as fair and as productive as any under the sun. Our schools are of the best. My people are intelligent and are fully able to understand the value of reciprocal trade with their brethren who have gone to Canada to develop that country, and so at the close of this great debate, which has so fully covered all lines of thought, I do not agree, Mr. Chairman, with the gentleman from Kansas that this is the proper time to place into the treaty any amendments, for reasons fully stated by the friends of the treaty. I am in favor of reciprocity, and I am in favor of this bill, but I am not in favor of defeating it by adding on any amendments here to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer one word that strikes particularly at the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MADISON]. He moves to strike out line 24, which is a provision of 10 cents per thousand on lath. Now, with that section stricken out the old Payne tariff rate attaches of 20 cents a thousand, so the gentleman's amendment is not worth consideration for even a moment.

Mr. MADISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I can not yield. If the gentleman had moved to put lath on the free list, it might at least have been consistent, but as he offers to strike it out he accomplishes nothing and increases the rates from 10 cents, as provided in this pact, to 20 cents, as provided in the Payne bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, some gentlemen upon that side of the House seem to get all their consolation to-day from the misinterpretation of a statement made by me. The doubt as to whether the free-list bill would eventually become a law was not expressed or initiated by myself. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. MARTIN] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] and other gentlemen on that side of the House offered amendments putting upon the free list certain commodities, the products of the Dominion of Canada, because, they assured this side of the House, in that way alone could such articles be placed upon the free list. In the confidence, as they have been in the past and are now, of those directing the Republican Party, both in this House and in another House, they seem to have positive information that a free-list bill can not pass the present Republican Senate. When these gentlemen asked me if, in my opinion, the free-list bill was likely to pass and become a law, in view of the record of the Republican Party and in the face of the statements and the assertions made upon that side of the House, I expressed a doubt, and I said to them that unless some supernatural agency intervened it was very doubtful if the Republican Senate would within the very near future act in any way for the relief of the people or the country.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. However the gentleman arrived at the opinion, whether it comes from this side of the House or not, would not the gentleman advise his side of the House to clinch it by putting it in this bill which is likely to become a law?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not at all; the gentleman and myself are in hearty agreement. We know that those who are proposing such amendments are not friends of the bill, but those who desire its defeat. Let me read from the controversy indulged in between the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN] and myself:

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I would say to the gentleman, Yes, I will vote for that bill—

Referring to the free-list bill—

but the gentleman may rest assured that it will not pass.

And in view of the assertion made by the gentleman from South Dakota and his well-known and generally expressed views in favor of high-tariff rates, I could not withhold an expression of opinion that even at this time another branch of this Legislature had not awakened to the rising indignation of the American people, and that it would perhaps take another storm, the cleaning out of some other places, before the relief demanded by the people would be obtained from the Congress. Whatever lack of legislation there may be here in the interest of the people will not be due to the Democratic Party or to a Democratic House; it will rest upon the Republican

Party and that body which is now controlled by a Republican majority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish—

The CHAIRMAN. Debate has been exhausted upon the pending amendment. [Cries of "Regular order!"] The question is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas seemed to have it.

Upon a division (demanded by Mr. MADISON) there were—ayes 48, yeas 140.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Shingles, 30 cents per 1,000.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of enunciating this proposition. Frequent and unwarranted reference is being made to the position of this side of the House. No matter what might be the opinion of the gentleman from New York, or any other gentleman on this side, except the majority leader, his expression of opinion is only an expression for himself individually and does not in itself represent the position and attitude of this side. When this side wishes to express an opinion it will do so through the gentleman from Alabama, the majority leader, Mr. UNDERWOOD. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment—

Mr. MANN. I desire to say, Mr. Chairman, that the Clerk has no right to read so that nobody can hear.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was endeavoring to obtain order.

Mr. MANN. The Clerk should cease reading while the Chair is endeavoring to obtain order.

The CHAIRMAN. Order in the committee depends not so much upon the efforts of the Chair as upon the efforts of members of the committee. The Chair is endeavoring to obtain and keep order.

Mr. MANN. We are not criticizing the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will not read during disorder.

Mr. MALBY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MALBY. For the purpose of making an inquiry with reference to what the Clerk has just read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MALBY. The gentleman from Alabama has stated that we are not to be directed by what the gentleman from New York has said, but the gentleman from Alabama— [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is not in order.

Mr. MALBY. Well, the Chair can not determine whether I am in order until I have made my inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not in order.

Mr. MALBY. I move to strike out the last paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last paragraph.

Mr. MANN. I ask to have the amendment reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, strike out line 25.

Mr. MALBY. Mr. Chairman, I am not so particular how it may read here as how it will read to the country. The gentleman from Alabama suggests we are not following the lead of my colleague from New York, but of his colleague from Alabama.

I am not so particular as to whom we are to follow as to ascertain exactly what we are to follow. I would like to have my friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] state—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. MALBY] yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK]?

Mr. MALBY. Not yet. I would like to make an inquiry.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman is not discussing the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will proceed in order.

Mr. MALBY. I always proceed in order if I get a chance to proceed. In order that the House may know and that the country may know the position of the majority in Congress—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that the gentleman is not proceeding in order.

Mr. MALBY (continuing). I ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] in reference to this particular paragraph and amendments I proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida makes the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the amendment. Under the rules pertaining to debate under the five-minute rule debate must be confined to the amendment or proposition before the committee. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. MALBY. I understand that. I am trying to do that, but my friend from Florida [Mr. CLARK] does not seem willing to have me proceed. I was simply trying to ascertain from the authoritative leader of the House of Representatives—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I must insist that the gentleman is not proceeding in order.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. MALBY. Not until I have completed my interrogatory.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Will the gentleman please state his amendment?

Mr. MALBY. The Clerk will report it again if there is any question about it.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

Mr. MALBY. Mr. Chairman, I would like a little further time. I suppose this is not being taken out of my time. Now that we have the policy of the House of Representatives fairly well understood, I would like to inquire specifically of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] whether or not the Democratic Party is in favor of placing lumber on the free list. I would just like an answer to that inquiry.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that the Democratic Party more than two years ago announced its position on that question in its platform, and the Members of Congress representing the Democratic Party are trying to carry out the platform. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MALBY. Mr. Chairman, that is hardly a specific answer to my inquiry. I want to know—

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. It is the best anyone can do with that kind of inquiry.

Mr. MALBY. I want to know specifically, so that we may carry the answer home to the people of the United States who are not—

Mr. CLAYTON. Just swear the witness. [Laughter.]

Mr. MALBY (continuing). In favor of free lumber. I want the Democratic Party through their authority, through the gentleman who represents them on the floor of this House, to state specifically whether they are in favor of free lumber or not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman, in order that I may save time, that we have introduced a bill putting lumber on the free list. I am for it, and I am sure this side of the House is for it, and we expect to pass it within the next few days or weeks. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MALBY. I think, Mr. Chairman, that fairly answers my question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will present the gentleman with a copy of the bill if he has not seen it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MALBY. Oh, I have seen the bill. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am very much pleased, indeed, to receive from such authoritative source the fact that our friends on the other side are in favor of free lumber.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MALBY. Mr. Chairman, I trust that the Clerk has not been taking out of my time all of this loose talk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair timed the gentleman, and the gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MALBY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to continue for a couple of minutes more.

Mr. ADAIR. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MALBY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to continue for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Chairman, my recollection is that the Clerk read line 25. Is not that true?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has read line 25.

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out line 25. I understand the gentleman from New York [Mr. MALBY] moved to strike out the last word.



Mr. HARDWICK. The gentleman from New York just made that motion to strike out line 25.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understood the motion of the gentleman from New York, it was to strike out the last two words just read. If so, the motion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MADISON] is in order.

Mr. MADISON. I desire to move to strike out the paragraph, but do not desire to discuss it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone desire to be heard in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. RAINEY. I do, Mr. Chairman. I desire to be heard in opposition, simply for the purpose of putting these lumber experts straight. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

I understand these gentlemen from Kansas are making these motions because they stand for free lumber. I understand also that the gentleman from New York made his motion because he stands for free lumber.

Mr. MALBY. Oh, no.

Mr. HARDWICK. He made his motion because he is opposed to it. It seems they are making these motions for opposite reasons. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RAINEY. They make these motions because they do not know anything about the tariff on lumber. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

I want to explain the matter to them, so that they can square themselves with their constituents.

Under the Payne-Aldrich bill laths are taxed 20 cents per thousand pieces. Under this bill laths are taxed only 10 cents per thousand pieces. And yet a while ago a gentleman from Kansas got up on the floor and moved to strike out line 24, and if he had succeeded in his motion he would have doubled the tariff on laths and would have restored the 20 per cent rate.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. RAINEY. I can not yield. The pending motion, for which the gentleman from Kansas also stands, is to strike out line 25. Under the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill shingles were taxed 50 cents per thousand. Under this paragraph, which the gentleman proposes to strike out, they are taxed 30 cents per thousand, so that if the motion which the gentleman stands for prevails he would put back the Dingley rate, 50 cents per thousand, which is 20 cents more than they now are.

Mr. MADISON. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Chairman, it seems the gentleman did not do me the kindness to listen to my remarks. Everybody else in the House understood what I said distinctly, which was that this is but one of a number of motions which I propose to make leading to the putting of lumber of every kind on the free list, and the Record will show it.

Mr. RAINEY. The gentleman is proceeding in the opposite direction, and when he makes these motions he is increasing, if his motions prevail, the tariff on lumber.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not understand, as I think the House does, that the gentleman from Kansas had in view the striking out of this paragraph here, and when we came to the free list putting it in there?

Mr. RAINEY. I do not know what the gentleman had in view.

Mr. NORRIS. Let us be consistent. If we want to get free lumber, let us strike out the duty where the duty is prescribed, and put it in the free list.

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman's time expired? If so, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. MADISON. I want to say this, that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] understood me clearly, and I want the House to understand me. I have this amendment already prepared and will offer it in due time when it is in order:

After the word "wharves," in line 25, page 17, strike out the period and insert a comma and add the words "shingles, laths, fence posts, sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, rough or dressed, except boards, planks, deals, and other lumber of lignum-vitæ, lancewood, ebony, box, granadilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet woods."

That is, put on the free list all the lumber that Canada produces. I tried to make myself clear to the House. Of course in order to get all classes and kinds of lumber from Canada on the free list it was necessary to strike out those paragraphs

and then offer the amendment I have just read. I propose to offer it, but I shall have nothing further to say on this subject. It has been pretty well discussed, and I do not desire to take up the time of the House. We all understand the situation. The bill as it stands admits rough lumber free and materially reduces the duty on manufactured lumber. That is a great deal, but I would make it absolutely free.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest this to the gentleman, in view of the impossibility of amending this bill, which he himself will admit, which I believe he did admit a while ago—

Mr. MADISON. Oh, I did not.

Mr. RAINEY. If he should succeed in carrying these amendments and then fail to get his free-list amendment in when we get to that, what position will the gentleman then occupy? He will have increased the tariff 100 per cent over the amount which this bill now proposes.

Mr. MADISON. I did not admit for one moment that this bill could not be amended.

Mr. RAINEY. I thought the gentleman had found out by this time that it can not be amended.

Mr. MADISON. I said that this House ought to amend it, and that in all probability it will be amended in important particulars in another body.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MADISON. Yes; if my time has not expired.

Mr. ADAMSON. If it is improbable that the Senate would pass the proposed free list, does not the gentleman think it would be equally unlikely that the Senate would pass this bill if articles on the proposed free list were incorporated in it?

Mr. MADISON. I do not know. I know that when the opportunity is presented to me to do my duty, I ought to do it without regard to what other men may do about it.

Mr. ADAMSON. That is what we are going to do with the free list.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. That is what we are going to do.

Mr. MADISON. That is the privilege of the gentlemen. I have no quarrel with them as to what they are about to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MALBY].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move, on page 7, line 25, to strike out "30 cents" and insert "1 cent."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 25, strike out "30 cents" and insert in lieu thereof "1 cent."

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, considerable has been said back and forth here about what is going to happen to this bill and to the so-called free-list bill after they get through this House. I do not pretend to know what will happen to either one; but every man here knows, from what has been said, that there is considerable doubt about the free-list bill becoming a law. That doubt has been expressed on both sides. It is generally conceded that this so-called reciprocity bill will become a law. Now, if we do not want to play politics, if we want to get results, then let us put onto the bill that everybody knows will become a law the legislation that we want.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT. If we put that on, will the bill become a law?

Mr. NORRIS. The amendment will become a law if the bill becomes a law.

Mr. ROBINSON. That is the question. Will it become a law?

Mr. NORRIS. Does the gentleman doubt that this bill will become a law?

Mr. CLAYTON. No.

Mr. NORRIS. Nobody doubts it.

Mr. GARRETT. I beg the gentleman's pardon—

Mr. NORRIS. Does the gentleman doubt that this bill will become a law?

Mr. GARRETT. I think it will if it is not amended.

Mr. NORRIS. The gentleman wants free lumber. Let us give it on this bill.

Mr. GARRETT. But if we put it into this bill, does the gentleman think this bill will become a law?

Mr. NORRIS. Why, yes. I do not see why it will not become a law if we pass it, for then it will be in the bill, and the bill will become a law.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman from Nebraska is one of the keenest men in this House. Does he not know that an amendment to the bill will defeat the bill?

Mr. NORRIS. On the other hand, I do not believe any such proposition. In view of the high intelligence and wisdom of the gentlemen who have made that statement here, I can not understand why they should make a statement of that kind.

The gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Oklahoma, speaking against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas, said that it would increase the rates. I think we understand what the parliamentary procedure would have been had the gentleman's motion prevailed, and had it carried we would have put lumber on the free list. If we pass this amendment I have offered, or in the consideration of it the arguments made by these gentlemen against it do not prevail, it will reduce the tariff on lumber from the country that we want to get it reduced from, practically the only country on earth that would do us any good to get free lumber from.

Now, then, if reducing duty on shingles from the Payne bill to the amount named in this bill—from 50 cents to 30 cents—is good, and we want free lumber and free shingles, let us reduce it from 30 cents to 1 cent. [Applause.] If you want free lumber, for God's sake vote for it instead of trying to make political capital out of the bill.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Chairman, I have not taken the time of the House during this debate, and therefore I ask your indulgence for five minutes. The Democratic Party does not present this bill as its ideal of tariff legislation. It is by no means all that we desire. We present it, though, on account of the political situation in the country, the House being Democratic and the Senate being of the opposite political complexion, and with a Republican President.

If we were playing politics, as some gentlemen have suggested during the progress of this debate that we were, we would present our tariff measure complete and as a whole and let the Republican Senate and President turn it down, so as to bring upon those branches of the Government the same just condemnation of the public that has already been visited upon this branch, which has made so many absent seats on the Republican side of this Chamber. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We are giving the people of the United States a half loaf, which is better than none. We are giving them now, so far as we have the power to give them anything, something that can pass both branches of this Legislature and be approved by the President of the United States.

We can not shut our eyes to the fact that there is violent opposition, not only on this floor but at the opposite end of the Capitol, not only in this country but in another country that is affected by this reciprocal agreement, to its passage. Some gentlemen have raised the question that the President had acted beyond his power in this matter. We say in answer to that that it is not a question of power, but a question of policy that is involved in this matter. No man on this side contends that the President of the United States has the power to attempt to originate tariff legislation, and no man on that side or on this side can truthfully say that he has attempted to do it in this case. He has simply suggested to the Congress of the United States that he has been able to secure an agreement with certain executive authorities of the Dominion of Canada by which the parties have agreed to recommend to the legislative branches of both Governments laws to carry out this agreement for reciprocal reduction of tariff duties between the two countries.

If the House passes this bill it will be legislating on its own initiative and in accordance with its own will entirely. So that when the Democratic majority in this Chamber stands by the President in this matter, when we say we will take this proposition as it comes to us from him unamended, we will take this agreement for lower tariff duties as recommended by the executive departments of both countries, we also say we will not load it down with amendments, in this Chamber at least, where we have both the power and the responsibility. We will not give to the Republican Senate an excuse to kill it; we will not give to the opposition party in the Dominion of Canada a pretext to slay it. Therefore, although this legislation is not perfect, although we favor free lumber and many more tariff reductions that can not be carried in this bill, which is intended to carry out a reciprocal agreement already negotiated, yet we will give the people of the United States a chance to get at least these tariff reductions on Canadian products, if it can be accomplished during the present session of Congress, without delay, and we will not play politics with it and load it down with amendments that might give its enemies at the

other end of this Capitol an opportunity as well as an excuse to kill it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. NORRIS) there were—ayes 46, noes 110.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, planed or finished on one side, 50 cents per 1,000 feet, board measure; planed or finished on one side and tongued and grooved, or planed or finished on two sides, 75 cents per 1,000 feet, board measure; planed or finished on three sides, or planed and finished on two sides and tongued and grooved, \$1.12½ per 1,000 feet, board measure; planed and finished on four sides, \$1.50 per 1,000 feet, board measure; and in estimating board measure under this schedule no deduction shall be made on board measure on account of planing, tonguing, and grooving.

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, strike out lines 1 to 12, inclusive.

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further remarks to make about the matter. I have no desire to delay the House. There has been full expression of opinion in respect to it, and so far as I am concerned I have no further discussion to make.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of opposing this amendment, because of the avowed purpose of its author to ultimately move to place lumber upon the free list. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] stated that we want lumber upon the free list. I do not know to whom he referred when he said "we."

Mr. NORRIS. I did not refer to the gentleman from Kentucky. [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGLEY. I hope not, but I beg to inform the gentleman that there are a great many on this side of the House—

Mr. NORRIS. And a great many on the other side, too.

Mr. LANGLEY (continuing). Who are protection Republicans, and who do not want lumber on the free list; and I want to say that I am reliably informed that there are a good many gentlemen upon the other side of the House, too, who do not want lumber upon the free list. [Applause.] I believe that if gentlemen voted untrammelled, voted their real sentiments—the way they actually feel about it—on that side as well as upon this side of the House, there would not be the ghost of a chance of this reciprocity treaty passing the House of Representatives. I claim the same right to stand for the local interests of my district as gentlemen on that side do for the local interests of theirs.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LANGLEY. Not now. The wishes of the people interested in the lumber industry in the mountains of Kentucky appeal to me just as much as do the wishes of those interested in the mica or peanut industries in North Carolina or the fish industry in Massachusetts or in any other industry in any other section of the country that may be affected by this measure. I come from what is generally considered a Democratic district. Three times I have been elected on a platform favoring protection to lumber. I am glad to have the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] state here to the House and to the country that the Democratic Party stands for free lumber now. A good many who opposed me for Congress contended that the Democratic Party did not and would not. I was elected two years ago over a gentleman nominated by the Democratic Party who announced that he was not only in favor of protection to lumber, but that he was in favor of doubling the Republican rate of protection upon it, and the rate then was higher than it is now—the Dingley rate being then in force.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Well, you ought to have defeated that kind of a man.

Mr. LANGLEY. Well, I thought so, too, although he was not as bad as some of you are on this tariff question.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY (continuing). And if all of the people in my district had believed what the gentleman from Alabama stated awhile ago, my majority last fall, notwithstanding the Democratic landslide over the country, would have been 4,000 instead of 2,000, as it was.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield—

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield to gentlemen on either side of the House. I do not want to be discourteous to anybody, and especially to my friend from Massachusetts and my friend from New Jersey, but I have not the



time. The gentleman from Massachusetts says that he wants to help me by asking me a question. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. He did not have anything on me. I wanted to do the same thing. [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am exceedingly obliged to my friend from New Jersey, who is always courteous to this side of the House, and also to my friend from Massachusetts, who seems to desire to help me, but I do not feel that I need any help. [Laughter.] The people of my district have commissioned me, Mr. Chairman, to vote against any proposition looking to the placing of lumber upon the free list, and I propose to carry out their commission and cast my vote accordingly.

Mr. Chairman, the prosperity of the lumber industry involves a living for many a poor man and his family in my district, and I know that it means the same thing in many other States of this Union. It is the second or third greatest industry in the United States, involving millions and millions of dollars and the wages of thousands and thousands of men. If free lumber from Canada will depress the lumber industry, as I believe it will, then I am opposed to it; if it will not have that effect, then it will not help or hurt anybody, and the only result will be the presentation to Canada of that much revenue which would otherwise go into the Treasury of the United States to help bear the expenses of our Government; and all foreigners look alike to me when it comes to injuring our home markets by letting foreign products in. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Coal, bituminous, round and run of mine, including bituminous coal such as will not pass through a three-quarter inch screen, 45 cents per ton.

Mr. FOSTER of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Because of the great demand for time on the Republican side of the House, I failed to secure an opportunity to discuss this measure during the general debate; and I shall not attempt any general discussion of the measure now under the five-minute rule. But I feel that it is due myself and due the farmers of my district that I repudiate the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL]. In closing the general debate in behalf of those Republicans who favor the measure he strongly intimated his belief that the farmers of the country, in opposing reciprocity with Canada, were not acting in good faith, were not expressing their own convictions, but were being made the cat's-paw by the big interests. I hold no brief for the farmers of the country at large; but I can speak for the farmers of my district and for the farmers of Vermont. And so far as they are concerned, the insinuation of the gentleman from Massachusetts is slanderous in the extreme. The farmers of Vermont are opposed to reciprocity because of their conviction that it is an utterly unfair discrimination against them and against the farmers of the country as a class. Let me read to you a letter written on the 20th of last January, before the details of the provisions of the agreement were generally known. The writer is one of the progressive farmers of my district, and the letter voices the convictions of the farmers of Vermont:

ST. ALBANS, VT., January 30, 1911.

Hon. D. J. FOSTER, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FOSTER: I believe that portion of your constituents which is made up of the farmers of Vermont has a genuine cause for alarm in the prospect of the passage of the proposed reciprocity treaty with Canada, and I would like to give you my reasons for this belief.

I realize that in the just settlement of this tariff question there should be a patriotic consideration of the greatest good for the greatest number, but from the newspaper reports of this treaty we can see no just distribution of its burdens or its benefits. The Washington correspondent of the Journal of Commerce says that the plan of the commission has been to select the commodities for reciprocity in such a way as to arouse the smallest amount of antagonism on either side of the border. I presume that it was in keeping with this policy that the articles which are on the proposed free list are, with the one exception of fish, made up of products of the farm. I am fully aware that the agricultural interests have the least effective business organization of any industry in the country, and for that reason they are the least prepared to offer effective resistance to any encroachment upon their rights, but we can at least appeal to the sense of justice of the President and Congress of the United States.

As farmers we would not greatly object to free trade with Canada or to a reciprocal agreement which would enable us to benefit by the lower cost of many things which, as consumers, we could purchase in Canada, because we realize that we would have little to fear from a free interchange of commodities with a people having a standard of living and economic resources similar to our own, but we maintain that a treaty like the one proposed, which throws the whole burden upon agriculture and gives no benefits in return, is manifestly unfair.

If the farmers of this country were unduly prosperous and were accumulating large fortunes, we could see some justice in such a course, but I maintain that such is not the case. We invite the fullest investigation into the profits in farming, even where it is conducted in the most careful and scientific manner, with the full knowledge that the profits, after deducting labor, interest, and other fixed charges, would be

very small in comparison with the profits in the manufacturing industries which you are asked to favor by this treaty.

I ask you to consider the history of American agriculture for the past century. The inducements offered by the Federal Government for the rapid settlement of the new lands of the West, the invention of machinery to till these lands and to harvest the crops grown upon them, and the building of railroads to transport these crops to market all worked to cause a production of foodstuffs far in excess of the demand. A system of farming based upon soil robbery resulted, and much of the time farm products were produced at a loss if labor and depletion of soil fertility had been taken into account. Farmers became discouraged, boys who could get away left the farms, and the business was considered a good one to get out of. All this time, when the prices of our farm products were determined by the surplus sold in free-trade markets, we were allowed a high protective tariff on foodstuffs. In the past few years a change has taken place. Population has increased so that consumption has overtaken production and prices have increased so that the farmer is able to get a living wage for his work and some interest on his investment. We have passed from the soil-robbery stage of our agriculture to the higher stage, which requires trained men who see the need of maintaining the fertility of the soil.

The past 10 years of higher prices have witnessed the employment of more capital and better methods, and the farms have responded with a larger and surer production to meet the need of the increasing population, but the record so far but points the way to what the farms of this country may do by the employment of yet more capital and generally improved methods.

I maintain that our experiment stations and good farmers in every State have demonstrated that the producing power of our farms may be made several times what it is now and that we can take care of our population for centuries to come. Now, to satisfy the demand of consumers for cheaper food, it is proposed to place upon us the burden of competition with millions of acres of cheap virgin soil. Out of every dollar that the consumer now pays for food we get but 35 cents, the other 65 cents going for transportation and distribution, and this 35 cents is not now giving us more than a fair compensation for our work.

We ask you to consider if it is wise to interrupt the development of our own agricultural resources, which has now been so well begun, while once more the process of soil robbery and profitless agriculture is carried on in a foreign country. We farmers of Vermont have everything to lose and nothing to gain by this treaty, and we are expecting you to protect our interests.

With kindest regards to you in every way, I am,

Very truly, yours,

E. L. BINGHAM.

My colleague Mr. PLUMLEY has handed me two letters addressed to him, one of the 25th and one of the 26th of last January, by one of the leading farmers in his district, showing that when the news of the reciprocity agreement with Canada reached the Vermont farmers they did not wait to hear from the "big interests," but promptly sent in their protest. Let me read these letters:

WATERBURY, VT., January 25, 1911.

Hon. FRANK PLUMLEY, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I inclose clipping from yesterday's Boston Globe, which leads me to ask you if you are earnestly looking after the interests of the farmers of Vermont in connection with reciprocity with Canada.

This man GARDNER, and all other Massachusetts Representatives in Congress and such representatives outside of Congress, as the notorious Foss, are demanding an open market for Canadian farm products, but all their own interests must be protected. Not for 25 years, until within the last 3 or 4 years, have Vermont farm products returned the cost of production.

No one seems to know what kind of a trade the President has made with the representatives of Canada, but I suppose we shall know after to-morrow, and I hope and believe that you will not fail the Vermont farmer, for he is going to need your best efforts now and in the next Congress as never before.

Very respectfully, yours,

GEORGE G. GRANT.

WATERBURY, VT., January 26, 1911.

Hon. FRANK PLUMLEY, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: These people are more sensitive in their pockets than in their stomachs where their own pockets are affected, but they will be just as insistent in their demand that they be fed at the expense of the Vermont farmer as they are in their demand for protection at the expense of all the people.

We do not ask for free fish; we are willing they should have all the protection they need. But we do ask for a square deal, and that we shall not be compelled to feed their mill hands on farm products that do not pay the cost of production that they may thereby hire those same mill hands at a lower wage.

Can you send me a copy of the present tariff law?

Respectfully, yours,

GEORGE G. GRANT.

The farmers of Vermont do their own thinking. They carry their own convictions under their own hats. They know by reputation the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL]. They recognize his ability, his scholarship, his high standing in Congress and out of Congress. But they could remind him that two years ago, when we were attempting to revise the tariff, he was one of a small coterie of "elder statesmen" that stood like a stone wall to prevent such a reasonable downward revision of the tariff as the people of the country had reason to expect at the hands of the Republican Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Live animals: Cattle, horses and mules, swine, sheep, lambs, and all other live animals.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

In line 5, page 16, strike out the word "sheep," and, in line 6, the word "lambs."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, yesterday, you will remember, it was contended on the floor of this Chamber that this bill put all the products of the farmer on the free list except wool. I want to call the attention of the Members of this House to the fact that it puts wool to a large extent on the free list. There is nothing to prevent sheepmen in Canada driving any number of sheep over the line before shearing time and after shearing drive them back again into Canada. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] That is all right, gentlemen, you laugh, and you simply laugh because you do not understand the conditions.

A MEMBER. Tell us about them.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I want to say that for 2,000 miles along the border sheep are run in bands from 1,000 to 5,000 head. There is nothing in the world to hinder the sheepman from running the sheep a hundred miles. He can drive down into the United States by slow stages to James Hill's railroad, shear them there, and take his time and drive them back again into Canada. You fellows laugh at this, but it is simply because you do not understand the conditions. That means the marketing of millions of pounds of wool from Canada that loses to the Government of the United States from 11 to 12 cents per pound duty. I simply wanted to call attention to this. You will not pay any attention to it, but the people of the United States will pay attention to it. [Laughter and cries of "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after the word "cattle" in line 5, page 16, the following: "Except cattle fattened for slaughter."

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to consume the time of the House in discussing the merits of this amendment. I want to call attention, however, to this fact, that when the convention between the Governments of Canada and France but a few years ago was negotiated by the representatives of their respective countries, the Senate of France refused to concur in it unless an amendment such as this was first incorporated.

And Canada acceded to it. Here is a precedent that we can amend this treaty; here is a precedent, in substance, where Canada has acceded to a similar amendment by another country. And while I do not expect this amendment will prevail here to-day, in view of the caucus action of the majority of this House, I want the Record to show, and I want the issue to be clearly presented, whether the people of this country, through their Representatives in this House or through their other responsible officials, are less concerned in the protection of the farming interests of this country than was the Government of France for the farming interests of France. I want the Record to show whether you gentlemen upon that side of the Hall are less in sympathy with our farmers than were the representatives of the French people in their Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. PICKETT].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 6, on page 16, after the word "animals," insert the following: "Fresh meats: Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and all other fresh or refrigerated meats; bacon and ham; meats of all kinds, dried, smoked, salted, in brine, or prepared or preserved in any manner; canned meats; extract of meat; lard and compounds thereof; and tallow."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I think the record of this afternoon's proceedings should show that when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] a short time ago made certain objections to placing these articles upon the free list he made one which was applauded upon the other side of the House, which was that to place these articles upon the free list in this bill would conflict with the favored-nation clause in our treaty. And yet, although they approved that sentiment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], they say that in three or four days they are going to pass a bill through this House placing these articles, all of them, upon the free list for the entire world. How do you reconcile that statement? Only in one

way—that it is still your hope that that free-list bill that you propose will never become a law, and you are opposed to these amendments to this bill because you know if they are adopted in this bill they will become a law.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] a short time ago said this would mean the defeat of the bill, but gave no reasons for it. How will it mean the defeat of the bill? Where will it be defeated? In the Senate? The Senate will have an opportunity to amend it, striking these out, if they desire to do so. Will it be vetoed by the President? Remember that the President, in his message transmitting this agreement to Congress, stated that in his judgment there was no difference in the cost of production between this country and Canada, either in agricultural products or manufactured products. With that statement upon record, is President Taft going to veto this bill if we place these articles upon the free list, where he has said there is no difference in the cost of production between this country and Canada? No, gentlemen upon the other side of the House, you have got to find some further excuse than you have yet given for defeating these amendments.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, right here and right now I believe that we ought to keep the record straight and to make it right. It is hard for me to believe that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], who last addressed the House, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MADISON] can not see what seems so clear. They talk about sincerity, and they insist so earnestly upon their amendments that I must give them credit for their sincerity, but they certainly know if we inject in this bill items of free imports in favor of Canada, that under our treaties with other nations, the favored-nation clause will make the items we put on the free list in this bill entitled to the free admission from every country, because every other nation will insist, and properly, that under our treaties with them they are entitled to the same rates accorded freely to Canada.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. Not yet. Knowing, then, that anyone who will vote conscientiously and honestly for the admission of one of these items into the free list in this bill will likewise vote for the same item in our free-list bill, and that those who are opposed to our general free-list bill will vote against this bill with these amendments in it—

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. HARDY. Not yet. I say, Mr. Chairman, they must know that to load this measure down with these additional items, making this bill, as I have explained, a free-list bill with all the world, under the favored-nation clause of our various treaties, we will give every man who is at heart opposed to this measure in the Senate a club with which to put it to death; and they must know this. Knowing that—

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to ask the gentleman whether the Senate will not have an opportunity, if it chooses, to strike out all of these amendments?

Mr. HARDY. Certainly it will; but, on the other hand, the Senate will also have an opportunity to vote on this measure as it comes from the House and, by these very amendments the gentleman is now insisting on, an excuse to kill it.

Now, the gentleman knows that if the Senate should really have a majority in favor of these items that he proposes on the free list, they can put them onto this bill and pass it in the Senate. I believe if they could ever get them onto this bill and pass the bill through the Senate we might vote on it here, and we would vote for it unhesitatingly if you will assure us that your President will not veto it. We will vote for every free item here that comes from the Senate. But we will not load the bill down here so that the Senate will kill it, and we will not give a chance to the President for vetoing it by loading it down at all. We will give the President his bill just as he has asked it and we will make the Republican Senate swallow it or repudiate their own President. [Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman from Texas yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. HARDY. I will.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to ask the gentleman whether he thinks he has got a better opportunity to get his free list through in a separate bill or on this bill, so far as the action of the President is concerned?

Mr. HARDY. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. I feel sure we will get what is in this bill if you do not kill it by amendments. I feel sure that if we pass this bill just as it is the Senate will pass it; and, as expressed in the Democratic caucus the other night, I believe if we get this bill through and place it on the statute books and then pass our



general free-list bill in the House and put it up to the Senate, that neither the Republican Senate nor the Republican President will have the nerve to veto it. Pass this bill as it is and I believe we will get both this bill and our free-list bill. Put these amendments on this bill and we will get nothing. [Applause on the Democratic side and cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Wheat, rye, oats, barley, and buckwheat, dried peas and beans, edible.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out all of lines 8 and 9, page 16, providing for placing wheat, rye, oats, barley, and buckwheat, dried peas and beans, edible, upon the free list.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, in support of that amendment, I would refer to what I have already said, that we are not granting to the consumer a reduction in the cost of living, because we maintain an almost similar duty under the terms of this bill to that which is placed on the manufactured commodities in the Payne tariff bill. I maintain that it is unjust to the producer to remove the duty from his raw material and to retain the duties upon the manufactured products, and that the argument for cheaper food is delusive to the consumer, because he will need to pay the price of the commodity in its manufactured state, and not as it is when it comes from the farmer. For that reason I offer this amendment. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fresh vegetables: Potatoes, sweet potatoes, yams, turnips, onions, cabbages, and all other vegetables in their natural state.

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 16, line 12, strike out the item "potatoes."

Mr. EDWARDS. What kind of potatoes, sweet or otherwise?

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the reason that there are various sections in the Northern States where the only crop of the farmer is potatoes, and I measure my words when I say this; and because of the further fact that northeastern Canada can raise enough potatoes to feed the world. It is a well-known fact to those who have investigated the subject that we can not compete with the Canadian farmers to-day, when they pay 25 cents a bushel on every bushel of potatoes that they bring into this country, and so how can we hope to compete, with potatoes on the free list? I make this motion because I believe that the farmers who are engaged in raising potatoes are entitled to have their interests protected, at least to the extent of some one offering here an amendment in their behalf. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KOPP].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fresh fruits: Apples, pears, peaches, grapes, berries, and all other edible fruits in their natural state, except lemons, oranges, limes, grapefruit, shaddock, pomelos, and pineapples.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 16, strike out the word "except" and strike out lines 17 and 18.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, there are several legislative curiosities in this so-called reciprocity agreement. This is one of them. In the provision regarding the admission of fresh fruit from the United States, on page 20, all fresh fruits grown in the United States are admitted free of duty into the Dominion of Canada; but when we come to the subject of the admission of fresh fruit from the Dominion of Canada into the United States, in line 16, page 16, this remarkable exception is made:

Except lemons, oranges, limes, grapefruit, shaddock, pomelos, and pineapples.

That was not done by accident, Mr. Chairman. The reciprocity treaty of 1854 was evidently before these commissioners and our so-called agents when this pact was making; yet they deliberately added this exception, giving protection against the Dominion of Canada for the fruits grown in our Southern States. After taking good care of the peanut industry of North Carolina, then, for fear that up on the Mackenzie River or somewhere along the Pacific coast of Canada there might be grown some semitropical fruits like oranges and lemons, they put in this provision. They have taken away from the northern fruit grower all protection against the fruits grown immediately across the line in Canada. They deny to the northern farmer the benefit of whatever southern fruits might be brought in from Canada to insure full protection in the South. It is one of the legislative absurdities of the bill which I commend to our Democratic brethren.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Dairy products: Butter, cheese, and fresh milk and cream: *Provided*, That cans actually used in the transportation of milk or cream may be passed back and forth between the two countries free of duty, under such regulations as the respective Governments may prescribe.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph just read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out lines 21 to 25, inclusive, on page 16.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, as the committee knows, these lines have special reference to butter, cheese, fresh milk, and cream. At the present time we have a duty on butter of 6 cents a pound. Notwithstanding that protection we imported butter from Canada last year to the amount, I believe, of something like 1,000,000 pounds, and after it had paid this duty of 6 cents per pound it competed with the butter produced by the American farmer on this side of the line. I shall not prolong this debate, but in justice again to the American farmer, I offer this amendment and trust it may prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I had an amendment prepared similar to that offered by the gentleman from Idaho taking dairy products from the free list. If there is any one branch of the great farming industry that is affected more than all others by this reciprocity agreement, it is the dairy industry. If there is any one thing that the Canadians can do better than anything else, it is to produce butter and cheese. Canada is one of the greatest producers of cheese in all the world. She has been producing it for many, many years, while the dairy industry in this country as we now know it is of comparatively recent origin. Twenty years ago there was no dairying as we speak of it to-day. Of course every farmer made butter and cheese on his farm, but there was no modern dairying as we know it to-day.

Since that time, by virtue of dairy instructions in our State universities and agricultural schools, and the scientific study of soils and grasses, the farmers in the Northwestern States have been able to develop a great industry.

The great dairy countries of the world, Mr. Chairman, are Denmark, Belgium, Holland, Norway, and Russia. Many years ago expert cheese makers and butter makers from most of these countries settled in Canada, and there they have developed this great industry. Only in recent years have we developed it in this country, and thereby we have added hundreds of millions of dollars to our wealth. We have been enabled to take farms in the rough country where nothing could be produced and by grazing them have developed great dairies.

Now, this last year there was exported by all countries that export cheese a total amount of 485,000,000 pounds, of which Canada exported 172,000,000 pounds, over one-third, while the United States exported but 10,000,000 pounds. Now, Mr. Chairman, the proposition is to throw open our markets to 172,000,000 pounds of Canadian cheese, to say nothing of the 6,000,000 pounds of butter which she also yearly exports, as compared to 9,000,000 pounds exported by us.

A great deal has been said as to the difference in the cost of cheese, or the price of cheese and butter in Canada and here.

In order to remove all doubt I went to the Library yesterday and went through the files of the Toronto Grocer, one of the leading dairy papers in Canada, and took the quotations on the 28th of every month, and took the same prices in Elgin for

butter and Chicago for cheese for that day. I will read you the results. Take butter:

*Average price of creamery butter for the year 1909, in Elgin and Toronto.*

	Elgin.	Toronto.
	Cents.	Cents.
January.....	30½	25½
February.....	29½	24
March.....	29½	21
April.....	28½	24
May.....	25½	23
June.....	26½	21
July.....	26	23
August.....	27½	21½
September.....	30	22
October.....	30½	24
November.....	31½	25
December.....	34½	25

On cheese the price differed from 2 to 4 cents a pound every single month in the year 1909, which is the last year for which we have the figures. The following shows the prices in detail:

*Average price of full cream cheese for the year 1909 in Chicago and Toronto.*

	Chicago.	Toronto.
	Cents.	Cents.
January.....	15	13½
February.....	15½	13½
March.....	16	14
April.....	16	13½
May.....	14	14
June.....	13½	13
July.....	14½	12½
August.....	15½	12½
September.....	15½	12½
October.....	15½	12½
November.....	16	12½
December.....	16	12½

If this agreement is adopted it will destroy these great industries. It is said that he is a coward who will not turn back when first he discovers that he is wrong. We are likewise cowards if we perpetrate this injustice upon a great industry of our country, an injustice so great that it will paralyze the industry.

When we throw open our markets to the 170,000,000 pounds of cheese and 6,000,000 pounds of butter which Canada annually exports we are saying to our dairymen, "You must make up your minds to take from 5 to 7 cents per pound less for your butter and 2 to 4 cents per pound less for your cheese than heretofore." This will practically ruin these producers. Is this just? Has the Republican Party ceased to be the party of protection? When did you, who are classed as Republicans, cease to believe in the theory of protection as promulgated in our last party platform? We pledged to the American manufacturer and the American farmer a protective tariff equaling the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad. We, who are classed as progressives, ask no greater protection than this, but we insist that we are entitled to that amount. Now you propose to throw this doctrine to the winds, and without even attempting to ascertain the cost of production at home and abroad you say to the farmer, "You must meet your competitor in our home markets whether you can produce as cheaply as he or not." In the preliminary report filed by the Tariff Board it is shown conclusively that the American dairyman can not produce a pound of butter or a pound of cheese as cheaply as his Canadian brother, but you ignore this. Whether it wrongs the farmers or not, you pay no attention to the fact that thousands of farms through Wisconsin and Minnesota can be made profitable by dairying when they could not be made profitable in any other way.

In the name of the dairymen of this country I protest against such action. I realize that the Democratic Party is going to put this through, assisted by a few Republicans, and it is folly for me to offer any amendments in behalf of these dairymen. Be that as it may, I should feel derelict in my duty if I did not voice their protests in as positive language as I can command. Again, I wish to protest in behalf of the thousands of firesides in our dairy States against this injustice. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Eggs of barnyard fowl, in the shell.

Mr. LANGLEY. On page 17, line 1, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 1, strike out the paragraph.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose of putting myself on record in opposition to this provision. The egg industry is an important one in my district, as well as in other agricultural sections of the country. A great many eggs are already imported from Canada under the present tariff rate. It will necessarily follow, if they are placed upon the free list, that a much larger number will be imported, and, according to the law of supply and demand, this will necessarily reduce the egg market in this country; and on behalf of the farmers who will be injured by this provision I have offered this amendment, although I know from what has occurred here this afternoon that it is fruitless for me to offer it, because I already hear the machinery of the steam roller starting up, and the gentleman in charge of it is becoming impatient to roll it over this amendment as he has over all others of a like character that have been offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Seeds: Flaxseed or linseed, cotton seed, and other oil seeds; grass seed, including timothy and clover seed; garden, field, and other seed not herein otherwise provided for, when in packages weighing over 1 pound each (not including flower seed).

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 17, strike out all of lines 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, flaxseed is a product of the Northwest. When ground is broken up in a new country that is the first crop that is raised. It is the poor man's crop. This industry has grown in this northwest country and the duty should be left on flaxseed to protect and to help the new settlers. I hope my motion may prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fish of all kinds, fresh, frozen, packed in ice, salted, or preserved in any form, except sardines and other fish preserved in oil; and shellfish of all kinds, including oysters, lobsters, and clams in any state, fresh or packed, and coverings of the foregoing.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Beginning on line 9, page 17, strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Seal, herring, whale, and other fish oil, including cod oil: *Provided*, That fish oil, whale oil, seal oil, and fish of all kinds, being the product of fisheries carried on by the fishermen of the United States, shall be admitted into Canada as the product of the United States, and, similarly, that fish oil, whale oil, seal oil, and fish of all kinds, being the product of fisheries carried on by the fishermen of Canada, shall be admitted into the United States as the product of Canada.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 14, after the word "herring," strike out the word "whale"; and also, on lines 15 and 19, strike out the words "whale oil."

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, the ships in Canada that are engaged in the whale-oil enterprise are constructed in Norway and cost \$23,000 each. The American ships that compete with them are manufactured in American shipyards, by American workmen receiving American wages, and fly the American flag, and cost \$80,000 each.

Mr. Sisson. Then buy them in Norway.

Mr. KAHN. The men who man the Canadian ships are Chinese and Japanese. The men who man the American ships are white men. The Chinese and Japanese get \$40 a month and feed themselves. The white men on the American ships get \$75 a month and are fed by the companies that manufacture the whale oil. If you allow the product of Canada to come in free, as contemplated by the pending measure, you wipe out an American industry and you again drive American ships off the seas.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Timber, hewn, sided or squared otherwise than by sawing, and round timber used for spars or in building wharves.



Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, strike out lines 24 and 25.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, let me explain here that I am also going to move to strike out the four succeeding paragraphs on page 18 of this bill. All five of these paragraphs, you will observe, propose to put lumber, in some form or other, upon the free list. I am opposed to all of it. I think we have little enough protection to lumber now. I have already indicated, as fully as I could in five minutes, my views upon this question, and I thought I would explain now that it is my purpose in offering all five of these amendments to take lumber in any form off the free list embodied in this treaty, so that when I offer these four amendments I can do so without explanation. Moreover, it is evident that it is perfectly useless to make an argument in support of all of these amendments, as those favoring the treaty have already demonstrated that they do not proposed to permit an amendment to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "wharves," in line 25, page 17, strike out the period and insert a comma, and add the words "shingles, laths, fencing posts, sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, rough or dressed, except boards, planks, deals, and other lumber of lignum-vitæ, lancewood, ebony, box, grandilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet woods."

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Chairman, I have nothing further to say upon this matter. It is simply one of a series of amendments that I stated that I would offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, not further manufactured than sawed.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out lines 1 and 2 on page 18.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, lines 1 and 2, strike out the words "not further manufactured than sawed."

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, this in effect is the same proposition again, and if adopted will give free lumber. I am not going to take up the time to discuss it [applause] except to say—well, Mr. Chairman, since there seems to be such a unanimous expression of delight that I am talking I think I will discuss it. I am in hopes you brethren over there will have by this time been able to solve the proposition properly and have given sufficient consideration to the reasoning that has been poured out here for your benefit that if you really and truly are in favor of free lumber you will adopt this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, not further manufactured than sawed.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out lines 1 and 2, on page 18.

Mr. LANGLEY. I see the steam roller is operating—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not in order. The amendment was properly put and acted upon by the committee. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Paving posts, railroad ties, and telephone, trolley, electric-light, and telegraph poles of cedar or other woods.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out lines 3 and 4 on page 18.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, as I said a while ago it is evident the House does not want to hear any further debate—

SEVERAL MEMBERS. That is right.

Mr. LANGLEY. I started to say, I see that the steam roller is oiled and ready to roll over all these amendments, and I do not desire to detain the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Wooden staves of all kinds, not further manufactured than listed or jointed, and stave bolts.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out lines 5 and 6 on page 18.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to discuss the amendment for the reasons already stated.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the item the gentleman is trying to strike out has been passed.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I understood the Clerk had read down to "stave bolts," in line 6, and I moved to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman's amendment is in time. If there is any confusion it was due to the Chair's fault. The question is upon the amendment of the gentleman, which is to strike out lines 5 and 6 on page 18.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pickets and palings.

Mr. LANGLEY. I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Kentucky ought to give his reasons— [Cries of "Oh, no!"]

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I think there ought to be some display of the intelligence that lies behind such a motion.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman from Tennessee, who is always courteous and amiable, does not mean quite what his language might imply. He will recall that I said to the committee a little while ago that I would offer a motion to strike out all these paragraphs to place any lumber in any form on the free list, because I did not think that we have any too much protection on lumber now. Moreover, out of consideration for gentlemen on that side who have been protesting against debate on all these amendments to the treaty, I have refrained from debating these other motions to strike out the free lumber provision. I could debate them and give an intelligent reason, I think, why the motions should be adopted. But I know the gentleman from Tennessee and the other gentlemen on both sides have made up their minds to vote down all of these amendments, and there is no need of my wasting any more breath upon the subject. I merely wanted to put myself and the majority of the House on record.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Plaster rock, or gypsum, crude, not ground.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out in line 8, page 18, the following words, to wit: "Plaster rock, or gypsum, crude, not ground."

[Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence of the Members of this House for only a few moments in order to say a few words which I think I am in duty bound to say in defense of what I think is justice to my congressional district. Under this paragraph of the treaty crude gypsum is placed on the free list. As some of you know, doubtless, gypsum is the substance from which, at the present day, common wall plasters for our houses are made. It exists in abundant quantities in many of the States of this Union. When, at the last session of Congress, the Ways and Means Committee had under consideration what is known as the Payne-Aldrich bill, there were extended hearings on the question of how much duty should be levied upon gypsum. Under the Dingley bill the tariff on crude gypsum was 50 cents per ton. The bill, as it passed the House, reduced it from 50 cents to 40 cents a ton. I thought there was no demand for that, but the bill went to the Senate, and there the duty was reduced to 30 cents a ton. Under this trade agreement crude gypsum is placed on the free list.

I want to say that the State which I have the honor in part to represent is great in many respects. Great in agriculture,

because there is no State in the Union that grows so abundantly such a vast variety of agricultural products. I am opposed to this bill because I believe it does an injustice to the great agricultural interests of my State. But Oklahoma is a great State from the standpoint of its wealth in minerals—coal, oil, gas, iron, asphalt, glass sand, gypsum, and many other minerals. In my congressional district Providence has deposited absolutely unlimited deposits of gypsum. My congressional district has the crude gypsum sufficient to supply not only the United States, but the entire world with gypsum.

Now, then, in 1910, the little tariff of 30 cents per ton upon crude gypsum brought into the Treasury of the United States over \$100,000. You gentlemen who believe in a tariff for revenue only ought to support the little tariff of 30 cents per ton upon crude gypsum. The effect of this bill will be to take \$100,000 out of the Treasury of the United States and put it in the hands of a few manufacturers of gypsum in the northeastern portion of the United States. People who build houses will not get plaster for their houses any cheaper. This is a discrimination against the gypsum of the West. It appears to me that the men who prepared this so-called treaty, or pact, could not look down into the Southwest a thousand miles away and see the gypsum in the second congressional district of Oklahoma. They did, however, look up north and see the gypsum beds of Nova Scotia, New Breton, and Newfoundland, and placed gypsum on the free list for the benefit of the owners of Canadian gypsum deposits, and the owners of gypsum mills in the northeastern portion of the United States. I enter my solemn protest against this injustice. I believe in the policy of protection. I love my great new State, where I have lived ever since its birth. We have magnificent opportunities for agriculture, and we have magnificent opportunities to become a great manufacturing State. No measure shall have my support that I believe will retard the growth and development of my State or that discriminates against the industries of my people. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fluorspar, crude, not ground.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, on page 18, line 13, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, strike out line 13.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, the Payne tariff law placed a protective duty upon fluorspar. Prior to that time this industry was not protected. The question was fully considered at the last session, and it was found that there are fluorspar mines in Kentucky, Illinois, and a number of other States, but that the ruinous competition of the foreign mineral prevented these mines from being successfully operated. This protective duty was accordingly imposed, justly, I think, and the wisdom of it has been demonstrated by the profitable operation of these mines since then.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Are the gaugers interested in this?

Mr. LANGLEY. The gaugers are probably interested, I will say to the gentleman; they are good Kentuckians and naturally want to see all of Kentucky's industries prosper. This is an important industry in Kentucky. I am satisfied that you are going to vote this amendment down, of course; but I have the right, I think, to offer it and be heard a moment on it, if I desire to be heard. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

It has been only two years since this question was considered by Congress and this duty fixed as a result. I for one am opposed to nullifying by a treaty action so recently taken by Congress, after due deliberation, and therefore I move to strike this paragraph out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rolled round wire rods in the coil, of iron or steel, not over three-eighths of an inch in diameter, and not smaller than No. 6 wire gauge.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add after line 14, page 19, the following:

"Plows, tooth and disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horse-rakes, cultivators, threshing machines and cotton gins, farm wagons and farm carts and all other agricultural implements of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts."

"Bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and all similar fabrics, materials, or coverings, suitable for covering and baling cotton, composed in whole or in part of jute, jute butts, hemp, flax, seg, Russian seg, New Zealand tow, Norwegian tow, aloe, mill waste, cotton tares, or any other materials or fibers suitable for covering cotton; and burlaps and bags or sacks composed wholly or in part of jute or burlaps or other material suitable for bagging or sacking agricultural products."

"Hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, punched or not punched, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton or any other commodity; and wire for baling hay, straw, and other agricultural products."

"Grain, buff, split, rough and sole leather, band, bend, or belting leather, boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value of leather made from cattle hides and cattle skins of whatever weight."

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that enough has been read already to show that the amendment is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut makes the point of order that the amendment is not in order. The Chair will examine the amendment. The gentleman from Connecticut will state his point of order.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, the point is that the amendment is in violation of the rule, in that it is not germane to the question or paragraph.

Mr. BARTLETT. Or to the subject matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], if he desires to be heard on the question.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, if there is any point as to its being in violation of that portion of the rule which provides that no amendment shall be in order which is not germane to the subject matter in the bill, or which does not directly relate to the item to which the amendment is proposed, then, Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to change the amendment I have offered by offering it as a new paragraph.

Mr. MANN. That is what the gentleman did.

Mr. LENROOT. It is substantially that; and as to that, if the point of order is still made, I would like to be heard upon it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, reserving a point of order, as I understand the proposition, the gentleman offers an amendment relating to duties between this country and Canada, not the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is one enumerating numerous articles that shall be free of duty when imported from the Dominion of Canada into the United States. The bill before the committee is one arranging reciprocal trade relations between the Dominion of Canada and the United States. Had the amendment been one to put the articles enumerated on the free list, no matter from what country imported, it would have been clearly out of order. But in the opinion of the Chair, it being confined to articles imported from the Dominion of Canada, the amendment is in order, and the point of order is therefore overruled. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Of cattle of the bovine species, including calfskins; and harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished, composed wholly or in chief value of leather; and leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into manufactured articles."

"Barbed fence wire, wire rods, wire strands or wire rope, wire woven or manufactured for wire fencing, and other kinds of wire suitable for fencing, including wire staples."

"Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and meats of all kinds, fresh, salted, pickled, dried, smoked, dressed or undressed, prepared or preserved in any manner; bacon, hams, shoulders, lard, lard compounds and lard substitutes; and sausage and sausage meats."

"Buckwheat flour, corn meal, wheat flour and semolina, rye, flour, bran, middlings, and other offals of grain, oatmeal and rolled oats, and all prepared cereal foods; and biscuits, bread, wafers, and similar articles not sweetened."

"Timber, hewn, sided, or squared, round timber used for spars or in building wharves, shingles, laths, fencing posts, sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, rough or dressed, except boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, of lignum-vite, lancewood, ebony, box, granadilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet woods."

"Sewing machines, and all parts thereof."

"Salt, whether in bulk or in bags, sacks, barrels, or other packages."

[Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, this bill is the free-list bill proposed by that side of the House, which it is now proposed to apply to imports from Canada.

I am well aware of the fact that there is no attempt being made this afternoon to legislate upon this very important bill. Every Member on that side of the House, from the hustings all



over this country, has charged that this House has ceased to be a deliberative body. But, gentlemen, with your majority here this afternoon, I say that this House never was less deliberative since I have been here than it is at this moment. [Applause on the Republican side.] Your majority does not dare to consider these amendments upon their merits. You are bound and shackled by a party caucus, and if it was not for that, some of these amendments would be incorporated in this bill.

Now, gentlemen of the majority, if your free-list bill that you propose shall fail of passage, upon you will fall the responsibility before the country of refusing to secure some relief to the consumers of this country in reduction of duties. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have only a few words to say. It is apparent that the free-list bill that we intend to bring before the House next week means in many of its items a reduction of the cost of living to the people of the United States, because we put the articles on the free list as coming from all the world; but, so far as Canada is concerned, it is absurd to claim that agricultural implements or meats or many of the other products named in that bill would ever come from Canada in any considerable quantities if those articles were included in this bill. If the gentleman really desires to enact this free list into law, I hope after this bill has passed the House he will use his influence with the Senators of the United States who agree with him to enable us to send the bill to the President. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. The Senators from his State.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOF].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Provided*, That the articles above enumerated, the growth, product, or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada, shall be exempt from duty when the President of the United States shall have satisfactory evidence and shall make proclamation that the following articles, the growth, product, or manufacture of the United States or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila), are admitted into the Dominion of Canada free of duty, namely:

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Chairman, after the word "*Provided*," in line 15, on page 19, I move to insert the words "That this act shall not become operative before January 1, 1912," and after the word "duty," in line 17, I move to insert the word "only."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "*Provided*," in line 15, on page 19, insert the words: "That this act shall not become operative before January 1, 1912," and after the word "duty," in line 17, on said page, insert the word "only."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Chairman, my reason for offering this amendment is that this act affects principally the products of the farmer, and that there is now in the hands of the farmer a considerable part of the crops that were grown and produced with no suggestion that there would be any legislation that would materially affect the prices of these commodities, and that under those circumstances, if this bill should become a law, which I hope it will not, unless it is so amended as to equalize its provisions to all industries alike, it is only fair that its operation should not take effect upon the products that were grown while the present law existed, for, even in the prospects of the passage of this bill, there has been a lowering of the prices of the farm products, and the farming industry of this country has been injured to a very appreciable extent without any corresponding advantage to that industry.

If there was a general adjustment of the tariff so as to distribute the general effect, it would be quite a different proposition than that which here confronts us.

If this bill is to be enacted into law, let it be so amended that its provisions do not apply to the products of the last season, but to those only to be produced which have been planted with a knowledge that this bill is likely to become a law.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chairman, and hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LINDBERGH].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend line 18, page 19, by inserting, after the word "evidence," the following:

"That the Dominion of Canada has so revised its patent laws as to give to inventors of the United States holding Canadian patents the same privileges as are now given by the United States to inventors of Canada holding United States patents, and shall have satisfactory evidence."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I make the point of order that that amendment is not germane to this bill. It relates to the patent laws, and this is a treaty relating to tariff duties between the two countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, as pointed out two or three days ago, the patent laws of Canada are such that they require an American holding a patent from Canada either to sell his patent or to come to Canada for the purpose of manufacturing the article. Therefore, so long as these laws obtain, the concessions granted under this agreement are absolutely ineffective. It is an idle ceremony for this House to pass an agreement under which Canada proposes to give us concessions so far as access to her markets are concerned when she still retains within her internal legal system the power to render those provisions prohibitive and ineffective. Therefore, it seems to me, it is not only germane but necessary to adopt this amendment if we desire to make this agreement effective so far as Canadian markets are concerned.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard briefly on the point of order. While I shall not vote for the amendment if it be placed before the House, it seems to me that it is not subject to a point of order. As I understand the amendment, it is proposed to amend the proviso so that it will read that when the President of the United States shall have satisfactory evidence that—relating to the patent laws—he shall make proclamation that the following articles, and so forth. In other words, to make the dutiable and free list provided in the bill dependent in part upon the duties fixed by Canada and in part upon the revision of her patent laws. Clearly, it seems to me germane, in order to provide that our duties shall be reciprocal, and that we would have a right under this bill to add any provision as a condition precedent to our granting a lower rate of duty or the free list.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I did not quite get the reading of the amendment in full, but I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn, and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Pulp of wood mechanically ground; pulp of wood, chemical, bleached, or unbleached; news print paper, and other paper, and paper board, manufactured from mechanical wood pulp or from chemical wood pulp, or of which such pulp is the component material of chief value, colored in the pulp, or not colored, and valued at not more than 4 cents per pound, not including printed or decorated wall paper, being the products of Canada, when imported therefrom directly into the United States, shall be admitted free of duty, on the condition precedent that no export duty, export license fee, or other export charge of any kind whatsoever (whether in the form of additional charge or license fee, or otherwise), or any prohibition or restriction in any way of the exportation (whether by law, order, regulation, contractual relation, or otherwise, directly or indirectly), shall have been imposed upon such paper, board, or wood pulp, or the wood used in the manufacture of such paper, board, or wood pulp, or the wood pulp used in the manufacture of such paper or board.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following substitute for section 2.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Pulp of wood mechanically ground; pulp of wood, chemical, bleached, or unbleached; news-print paper, and other paper, and paper board, manufactured from mechanical wood pulp or from chemical wood pulp, or of which such pulp is the component material of chief value, colored in the pulp, or not colored, and valued at not more than 4 cents per pound, not including printed or decorated wall paper, being the products of the Dominion of Canada, when imported therefrom directly into the United States, shall be admitted free of duty, on the condition precedent that no export duty, export license fee, or other export charge of any kind whatsoever (whether in the form of additional charge or license fee or otherwise), or any prohibition or restriction in any way of the exportation (whether by law, order, regulation, contractual relation, or otherwise, directly or indirectly), shall have been imposed upon paper, board, or wood pulp, or the wood used in the manufacture of paper, board, or wood pulp by the Government of the Dominion of Canada, or any Province or other subdivision of government thereof, where the same was in whole or in part produced (either in the form of wood or pulp or otherwise) or manufactured: *Provided, however*, That the rates of duty as now collected upon the articles in this section mentioned shall in no case be increased.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, the only difference between the substitute I have offered and section 2 of the bill as now written is that before Canada can enjoy our markets free of

duty on print paper she must remove from each and every Province in Canada her embargo on pulp wood. I believe that it is only fair that, if we are to take the finished product from Canada or any other country in the world, that country should let free raw material come into our market unrestricted. This section is not as the bill was originally introduced at all. Therefore it is subject to amendment without affecting the bill. Section 2 as now in the bill was prepared by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and presented to the committee and adopted as a substitute for the section that was in the bill when it was first introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCall], because that section was not properly worded. The only difference between the sections in the bill and the one I offer is that Canada is required to remove her restrictions on pulp wood.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the situation in regard to pulp and paper is a little different in the bill from the situation as to any other article named. There is no prohibition of exportation on the other articles named in the bill. There is no export duty on pulp and paper coming from Canada into the United States. The Dominion of Canada has levied no charge, made no restrictions, fixed no export duty on pulp or paper coming from Canada into the United States. Most of the pulp paper probably will be made in the future at least from pulp wood cut on the public lands known as the Crown lands.

Those Crown lands are not owned by the Dominion of Canada; they are owned by the individual Provinces. Some of those Provinces are very much opposed to permitting any pulp wood to be exported from the Dominion into the United States. The Province of Ontario, for instance, whenever it sells pulp wood upon the Crown lands, puts into the contract the specific provision that that wood shall not be sent out of the Dominion of Canada for manufacture. The result of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Fordney], if he states it correctly, would be that any one Province of Canada could absolutely prohibit the taking effect of the provision in the bill and render entirely nugatory all of the legislation in reference to pulp and paper. It would no longer be the action of the Dominion of Canada, but any one Province by putting into a contract for the sale of its pulp wood the provision that that pulp wood should be manufactured in the Dominion of Canada would entirely prevent the operation of the law, if this be enacted into law, and the Province of Ontario or some other Province would take advantage of that power and entirely prohibit all benefits to come from this provision of the law.

In my judgment, it is to the interest not only of the paper consumers in the United States, but of the paper-manufacturing industry in the United States, that the great forests of black spruce in Canada may be utilized by exporting from Canada for the benefit of our paper mills that pulp wood controlled by these Provinces. If the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan should prevail, so far as paper and pulp are concerned, the bill might just as well be thrown into the waste basket, because it would never have any effect.

The proposition contained in section 2 is identically the language of the agreement. The first bill that was presented did not follow out the agreement. Somebody made an error in drawing the bill. While this section 2 has been called the Mann amendment, all I did was to take the language of the agreement, write it out, and present it to the Committee on Ways and Means, and the only thing left out of the agreement in the section as presented with reference to pulp and paper were these words, which were supernumerary:

*Provided, That such paper and board, valued at 4 cents per pound or less, and wood pulp.*

That was a repetition of language already in the agreement, so in drawing the section that language was left out. In other respects it is in the identical language of the agreement, and carries out not only the intent of the agreement, but makes a law which will be of benefit, in my opinion, both to the consumer and manufacturer.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman will admit that he prepared the amendment that I have offered? It was prepared by the gentleman, and I give him credit for preparing an exceedingly intelligent amendment to that bill. He brought the two amendments to the committee, and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Hill] offered the one that is now in the bill, and I offer this one.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(By unanimous consent leave was granted Mr. MANN to proceed for five minutes.)

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I was not able to be certain that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan was the other provision which I had prepared. I thought it was as it was read, but the gentleman misstated or erroneously stated its effect.

Mr. FORDNEY. Not intentionally.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; not intentionally. The provision in the bill will admit, if this becomes a law, at once, free of duty, paper or wood pulp made from pulp wood cut on private lands in Canada, on which there is no restriction of exportation.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan would admit paper and pulp from Provinces only as each Province removed all restrictions on the exportation of pulp wood, and would not treat the entire Dominion of Canada as an entity, but treats each Province by itself. There may have been doubt as to which was the better provision. While I think, under the terms of the agreement and under the terms of the bill, it is quite competent for the House, without disturbing the arrangement between the two Executives, to adopt either of those provisions, still, in my judgment, it is better, now that the provision which is in the bill is in the agreement, to follow the language of the agreement and admit the paper made from private-lands pulp wood free of duty without leaving the Provinces the power to control it. If I felt that it was necessary, and if it were not for the lateness of the hour, I would be glad to discuss the matter more at length, but I do not feel at this time at liberty to detain the House further in regard to the proposition. [Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me, I ask unanimous consent for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FORDNEY. Thank you, gentlemen; I will not take more than a minute. Instead of the gentleman's [Mr. MANN] statement being correct that the language in the bill is exactly as agreed upon by our representatives and the representatives of Canada, he is mistaken. I think the gentleman makes a mistake, an honest mistake, of course, because Mr. Fielding, on the floor of the House of Parliament in Canada, stated that the Government of the United States demanded this very same thing, but they were unable to agree to it because they could not bind the Provinces, showing conclusively that the matter had been discussed and that our representatives had aimed to get the very thing that I am asking for, but the Canadian representatives were unable to bind the Provinces. That was his statement and the substance of his (Fielding's) letter to our Secretary of State.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That for the purpose of further readjusting the duties on importations into the United States of article or articles the growth, product, or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada, and of the exportation into the Dominion of Canada of article or articles the growth, product, or manufacture of the United States, the President of the United States is authorized and requested to negotiate trade agreements with the Dominion of Canada wherein mutual concessions are made looking toward freer trade relations and the further reciprocal expansion of trade and commerce: *Provided, however,* That said trade agreements before becoming operative shall be submitted to the Congress of the United States for ratification or rejection.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk, to be added as an additional section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent the United States from amending or repealing the same at any time without notice to the Dominion of Canada, nor shall the Dominion of Canada be required to give to the United States any notice before amending or repealing any law responsive to this act.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I have just offered authorizes either this country or Canada to withdraw from the reciprocal trade arrangement now proposed at any time without notice to the other. The pending so-called Canadian reciprocity bill occupies a peculiar position. It is not a treaty, as some Members have seemed to suppose it is. It is merely a bill, which, if passed, will become a law of the United States. Then, if Canada passes a similar law, as specified in this act, the President is to issue a proclamation putting our law into effect. We authorize him to do so in the bill. But not one word is said in the bill as to how it is ever to be repealed,



if perchance we should be dissatisfied with it after a few years' trial. Neither is any method provided for its amendment. Manifestly, Canada has some interest in what we shall do in the way of amending or repealing this bill in the future. Our bill admits the products of Canada into this country upon certain terms, provided Canada shall pass a law admitting certain of our products into that country upon certain terms that we have specified.

Now, when the bill we are passing to-day becomes a law, and Canada has passed an act containing exactly the schedules upon our imports into that country that we have stipulated in our bill that she shall pass, it seems to me that a sort of a contract will have been entered into between the two countries. Neither country should arbitrarily withdraw from the agreement after it is entered into without giving some notice to the other, unless it is provided in the bill at the time we pass it that such a thing can be done. This is exactly what I propose by the amendment I have offered.

Reject this amendment and you may have a hard time getting out of the agreement you are now entering into, if you should ever want out. This country will at least desire to change the schedules of this trade arrangement, or some of them, from time to time, and unless this additional section be added no express power will be reserved to do so. Adopt the amendment, and either this country or Canada will be at liberty, without any specified notice to the other, to amend or repeal these reciprocal trade laws at any time. It would certainly be the part of wisdom to do so.

This afternoon I heard the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the leader of the Democratic majority in this House, request his party followers to vote against all amendments that shall be proposed to this bill. Therefore, I can have no hopes that the amendment I have proposed will be accepted. But it is something that has been overlooked, and I feel it is my duty to the country to offer it. Maybe if it is voted down here it will be added to the bill when it reaches the Senate, so that we will not tie our hands for all time to come to what may be a bad bargain.

If the Democrats had not held a caucus in advance of the consideration of this bill and decided on a set program, Members offering amendments at this time could have them fairly considered. For that reason I want to say in passing, that I am unalterably opposed to caucuses. I believe in leaving Members free to exercise their best judgment at all times, otherwise we are reduced from a deliberative body to a mere set of parrots repeating the votes of our so-called leaders.

I am friendly to the Canadian reciprocity bill, and am going to vote for it on the roll call. The amendment is not offered to embarrass those in charge of the bill on the other side of the House; it is offered to cover what appears to be a palpable omission. True, I believe the United States will have the right to repeal or amend this law at any time without having it so expressed in the bill, but it does appear that it would be much better to have that matter made clear and certain by having it stipulated in the bill. That is the sole object of the amendment I have offered in the form of an additional section to the bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House without amendment, with a recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of Union, reported that the committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 4412, the Canadian reciprocity bill, and had instructed him to report the same to the House without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I move the previous question on the bill to its final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was engrossed and read a third time.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means, with instructions to report the same back forthwith amended by placing on the free list lumber of all kinds, whether rough, dressed, planed, or grooved; shingles and lath, the product of the Dominion of Canada, when imported from Canada into the United States; and on that I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Nebraska.

The Clerk read as follows:

To recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back forthwith amended by placing on the free list lumber of all kinds, whether rough, dressed, planed, or grooved; shingles and lath, the product of the Dominion of Canada, when imported from Canada into the United States.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Nebraska for the previous question.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. The gentleman is not entitled to make that motion. There is no debate permitted on a motion to recommit.

Mr. NORRIS. The previous question, I think, is proper in order to prevent amendment.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. No amendment can be offered.

The SPEAKER. Without the previous question amendments will be in order. The point of order is overruled. The question is on the previous question on the gentleman's motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. NORRIS. On the motion to recommit I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to recommit, and on that motion the gentleman demands the yeas and nays. All those who are in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Fifty gentlemen have arisen—a sufficient number.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the other side.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty gentlemen have arisen, and the yeas and nays are refused.

The question is on the motion to recommit the bill.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. DALZELL, and several other Members demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the passage of the bill. Those in favor of the passage of the bill will answer "yea"; those opposed "nay." The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 268, nays 89, answered "present" 3, not voting 29, as follows:

#### YEAS—268.

Adair	Covington	Gould	Lewis
Adamson	Cox, Ind.	Graham	Linthicum
Aiken, S. C.	Cox, Ohio	Greene	Littlepage
Alexander	Crago	Gregg, Pa.	Lloyd
Allen	Cravens	Gregg, Tex.	Lobeck
Ames	Crumpacker	Griest	Longworth
Anderson, Ohio	Cullop	Hamill	Loud
Ansberry	Curley	Hamilton, W. Va.	McCall
Anthony	Danforth	Hamlin	McCoy
Ashbrook	Daugherty	Hardwick	McCreary
Austin	Davenport	Hardy	McDermott
Ayers	Davis, W. Va.	Harris	McGillcuddy
Barchfeld	Denver	Harrison, Miss.	McHenry
Barnhart	Dickinson	Harrison, N. Y.	McKinney
Bartholdt	Dies	Hay	Macon
Bartlett	Difenderfer	Heald	Madden
Beall, Tex.	Dixon, Ind.	Hellin	Madison
Beil, Ga.	Donohoe	Helm	Maguire, Nebr.
Berger	Doremus	Higgins	Maher
Bingham	Driscoll, D. A.	Hill	Mann
Blackmon	Dupre	Hobson	Martin, Colo.
Boehne	Dyer	Holland	Matthews
Booher	Edwards	Houston	Miller
Borland	Ellerbe	Howard	Mitchell
Bowman	Estopinal	Howland	Moon, Pa.
Brown	Evans	Hubbard	Moon, Tenn.
Buchanan	Faison	Hughes, N. J.	Moore, Tex.
Bulkley	Farr	Hull	Morrison
Burke, Pa.	Ferris	Humphreys, Miss.	Moss, Ind.
Burke, Wis.	Fields	Jacoway	Murdock
Burleson	Finley	James	Murray
Burnett	Fitzgerald	Johnson, Ky.	Needham
Butler	Flood, Va.	Johnson, S. C.	Nye
Byrnes, S. C.	Floyd, Ark.	Jones	Oldfield
Byrns, Tenn.	Fornes	Kent	Olmsted
Calder	Foss	Kindred	O'Shaunessy
Callaway	Foster, Ill.	Kinkaid, N. J.	Padgett
Candler	Francis	Kitchin	Pago
Cantrill	Fuller	Knowland	Palmer
Carlin	Gallagher	Konig	Parran
Carter	Garner	Konop	Patten, N. Y.
Cary	Garrett	Korbly	Pepper
Catlin	George	Lafferty	Peters
Clark, Fla.	Gillett	Lamb	Porter
Clayton	Glass	Lawrence	Post
Cline	Godwin, N. C.	Lee, Ga.	Pou
Collier	Goeke	Lee, Pa.	Rainey
Connell	Goldfogle	Legare	Raker
Conry	Goodwin, Ark.	Lever	Randell, Tex.
Cooper	Gordon	Levy	Ransdell, La.

Rauch	Sheppard	Stevens, Tex.	Turnbull
Reilly	Sherley	Stevens, Minn.	Tuttle
Richardson	Sherwood	Stone	Underhill
Roberts, Mass.	Sims	Sullivan	Underwood
Roberts, Nev.	Sisson	Sulzer	Utter
Robinson	Slayden	Sweet	Watkins
Roddenberry	Slemp	Switzer	Weeks
Rothermel	Small	Talbot, Md.	White
Rouse	Smith, N. Y.	Talcott, N. Y.	Wickliffe
Rubey	Smith, Tex.	Taylor, Ala.	Wilder
Rucker, Mo.	Sparkman	Taylor, Colo.	Wilson, Ill.
Russell	Speer	Taylor, Ohio	Wilson, N. Y.
Sabath	Stack	Thayer	Wilson, Pa.
Saunders	Stanley	Thomas	Witherspoon
Scully	Stedman	Tilson	Young, Mich.
Shackelford	Stephens, Cal.	Townsend	Young, Tex.
Sharp	Stephens, Miss.	Tribble	The Speaker.

## NAYS—89.

Akin, N. Y.	French	La Follette	Pujo
Anderson, Minn.	Gardner, Mass.	Langley	Rees
Bathrick	Gardner, N. J.	Lenroot	Rosenberg
Bradley	Good	Lindbergh	Rucker, Colo.
Burke, S. Dak.	Gudger	McGuire, Okla.	Simmons
Campbell	Guernsey	McKinley	Sloan
Cannon	Hamilton, Mich.	McLaughlin	Smith, J. M. C.
Claypool	Hammond	McMorran	Smith, Saml. W.
Copley	Hanna	Malby	Steenerson
Currier	Hartman	Martin, S. Dak.	Sterling
Dalzell	Haugen	Mondell	Thistlewood
Davis, Minn.	Hawley	Moore, Pa.	Towner
De Forest	Hayes	Morgan	Volstead
Dodds	Helgesen	Mott	Warburton
Doughton	Hinds	Nelson	Webb
Driscoll, M. E.	Howell	Norris	Wedemeyer
Dwight	Humphrey, Wash.	Patton, Pa.	Whitacre
Esch	Jackson	Pickett	Willis
Fairchild	Kendall	Plumley	Woods, Iowa
Focht	Kennedy	Powers	Young, Kans.
Fordney	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Pray	
Foster, Vt.	Kopp	Prince	
Fowler	Lafean	Prouty	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Kahn	Langham	Riordan
------	---------	---------

## NOT VOTING—29.

Andrus	Draper	Latta	Redfield
Bates	Gray	Lindsay	Sells
Brantley	Henry, Conn.	Littleton	Smith, Cal.
Broussard	Henry, Tex.	Loudenslager	Vreeland
Burgess	Hensley	McKenzie	Wood, N. J.
Davidson	Hughes, Ga.	Mays	
Dent	Hughes, W. Va.	Morse, Wis.	
Dickson, Miss.	Kipp	Payne	

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call my name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and he voted in the affirmative.

So the bill was passed.

The following pairs were announced:

For this session:

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. ANDRUS.

Until further notice:

Mr. HUGHES of Georgia with Mr. WOOD of New Jersey.

Mr. HENRY of Texas with Mr. VREELAND.

For to-day:

Mr. BRANTLEY with Mr. BATES.

For to-day and ending in three weeks:

Mr. LATA with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

On the reciprocity bill:

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut (in favor of) with Mr. KAHN (against).

Mr. KIPP (in favor of) with Mr. LANGHAM (against).

Mr. SELLS (in favor of) with Mr. DAVIDSON (against).

Mr. LITTLETON (in favor of) with Mr. LOUDENSLAGER (against).

Mr. PAYNE (in favor of) with Mr. MORSE of Wisconsin (against).

Mr. LANGHAM. Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?

The SPEAKER. In the negative.

Mr. LANGHAM. I am paired, Mr. Speaker, with Mr. KIPP, and I wish to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. LANGHAM, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The announcement of the result was received with applause.

On motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote just taken was laid on the table.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts, by unanimous consent, obtained leave of absence until April 26, on account of death in his family.

## WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. YOUNG of Kansas, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Anna F. Shepherd, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

## ADJOURNMENT OVER UNTIL MONDAY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] moves that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

## ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet on Monday, April 24, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers report of examination of Great Pedee River at Gibson Dam, S. C. (H. Doc. No. 23); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Auditor of the Treasury Department relating to the destruction of certain papers not needed for public business (H. Doc. No. 24); to the Joint Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers report of examination of harbor at Knife River, Minn. (H. Doc. No. 25); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers report of examination and survey of New Haven Harbor, Conn. (H. Doc. No. 26); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6728) granting pensions to teamsters of the War of the Rebellion, from 1861 to 1865, inclusive; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 6729) to provide for the selection and purchase of a site for and erection of a monument or memorial to the memory of Gen. George Rogers Clark; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 6730) to authorize the leasing of the Batan Island Military Reservation for coal-mining purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 6731) to provide for the sale of the surface and mineral deposits of the segregated coal and asphalt lands of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 6732) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Centralia, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 6733) to accept and fund the bequest of Gertrude M. Hubbard; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 6734) to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the consular districts of the United States in China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 6735) to authorize the exchange with the Coconino Cattle Co. of lands within the Coconino National Forest; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 6736) to provide for holding terms of United States courts at Hattiesburg, Miss.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6737) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6738) to authorize the St. Louis-Kansas City Electric Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the town of St. Charles, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 6739) to grant medals to survivors and heirs of volunteers of the Port Hudson forlorn-hope storming party; to the Committee on Military Affairs.



By Mr. HOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 6740) to provide for a survey of the lake front at Fairport, Lake County, Ohio; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 6741) to provide for the erection of a monument to the signers of the Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on the Library.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 6742) providing for the discontinuance of the grade of post noncommissioned staff officer and creating the grade of warrant officer in lieu thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COVINGTON: A bill (H. R. 6743) to provide American registry for the steamer *Minnesota* upon certain conditions; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 6744) granting pensions to widows and minor children of deceased soldiers and sailors of the War with Spain and the Philippine insurrection; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 6745) to remit the duty on pictorial windows to be imported by the Gate of Heaven Church, South Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 6746) to give effect to the fifth article of the treaty between the United States and Canada, signed January 11, 1909; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 6747) to authorize the Wisconsin Central Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the St. Croix River between Wisconsin and Minnesota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEVER: Resolution (H. Res. 119) asking for certain information of the President; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCCOY: Resolution (H. Res. 120) directing the Secretary of War to furnish information in regard to a water supply for Staten Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 121) directing the Department of Justice to furnish information in regard to a water supply for Staten Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAVENS: Resolution (H. Res. 122) authorizing the appointment of an assistant clerk to the Committee on Enrolled Bills; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 73) providing for the termination of the treaty between the United States of America and Russia, concluded at St. Petersburg December 18, 1832; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OLARK of Missouri: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 5) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce and Labor and the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics to collect and compile statistics relating to wars, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 6748) granting an increase of pension to David K. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6749) granting an increase of pension to Morgan M. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6750) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Barber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6751) granting a pension to Barbara A. Bauman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6752) granting an increase of pension to Elias Babione; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6753) granting an increase of pension to Melancthon Binkley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6754) granting an increase of pension to Romanes Binkley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6755) granting an increase of pension to James W. Beckwith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6756) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Cloud; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6757) granting an increase of pension to George W. Cushman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6758) granting a pension to James A. Dickinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6759) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Diedler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6760) granting an increase of pension to John Florkowski; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6761) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Grundy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6762) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6763) granting an increase of pension to Henry Homan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6764) granting an increase of pension to Aaron B. Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6765) granting an increase of pension to John Henry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6766) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6767) granting an increase of pension to Levi B. Leedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6768) granting an increase of pension to Absalom Mowery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6769) granting an increase of pension to John Z. Macon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6770) granting an increase of pension to James McNary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6771) granting an increase of pension to Tillman McLaughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6772) granting an increase of pension to Daniel S. Moses; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6773) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Overmyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6774) granting an increase of pension to William Poorman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6775) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas B. Querrin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6776) granting an increase of pension to Burton S. Rathbun; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6777) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Reineck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6778) granting an increase of pension to Orrell P. Rarick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6779) granting an increase of pension to George W. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6780) granting an increase of pension to John A. Shively; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6781) granting an increase of pension to Jacob R. Sprout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6782) granting an increase of pension to Maria A. Sinclair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6783) granting an increase of pension to Erasmus D. Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6784) granting an increase of pension to Markus Wolf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6785) granting an increase of pension to Christina Younkman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6786) granting an increase of pension to Henry Zender; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6787) granting a pension to Anna Rose Petty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6788) granting a pension to George Flora; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 6789) granting a pension to Juan Bautista Duran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 6790) for the relief of Charles I. Dague; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6791) for the relief of James W. Morgan; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6792) for the relief of Phil Sours; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6793) for the relief of Charles A. Bess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6794) for the relief of Lottie Rapp; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6795) for the relief of Katherine Ratchford; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6796) for the relief of Drs. Langworthy & Langworthy and others; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6797) to correct the military record of Judson N. Pollard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6798) granting an increase of pension to George S. Hampton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6799) granting an increase of pension to Francis Berry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6800) granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Sally; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6801) granting an increase of pension to Andrew T. Kyle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6802) granting an increase of pension to William Copeland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6803) granting an increase of pension to Frank B. Honza; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6804) granting an increase of pension to Henry Keeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6805) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Roe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6806) granting a pension to Franklin Barbour; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6807) granting a pension to Rebecca J. Billingslea; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6808) granting a pension to Alice Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6809) granting a pension to Alexander R. Banks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATHRICK: A bill (H. R. 6810) for the relief of Charles J. Callahan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 6811) for the relief of John Moynihan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 6812) granting an increase of pension to Ambrose Langley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6813) granting an increase of pension to James H. Conklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6814) granting an increase of pension to John L. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6815) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRANTLEY: A bill (H. R. 6816) granting an increase of pension to William Bennett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6817) granting a pension to John W. Bolt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6818) granting a pension to Alice A. D. Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6819) granting a pension to William F. Patten; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6820) for the relief of James I. Fountain; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 6821) to correct the date of discharge of Jerome L. Brown; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 6822) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of William F. McKimmy, administrator of the estate of John McKimmy, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 6823) for the relief of Pedro Fuentes, administrator of the estate of Guadalupe Lujan de Fuentes, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 6824) for the relief of John Carr; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 6825) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Burt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6826) granting an increase of pension to John Crew; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6827) granting an increase of pension to William L. Carr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6828) granting an increase of pension to Henry Tungate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6829) granting an increase of pension to William H. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6830) granting an increase of pension to Rachel A. Chadwick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6831) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hicks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6832) granting an increase of pension to Anton Ohnesorg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6833) granting an increase of pension to Meredith T. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6834) granting an increase of pension to J. F. Williamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6835) granting an increase of pension to John M. Hines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6836) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo D. Hays; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6837) granting an increase of pension to John P. Jefferies; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6838) granting an increase of pension to James C. Rule; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6839) granting an increase of pension to William H. McGary; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6840) granting a pension to Elizabeth Farishon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6841) granting a pension to Jerry Fitzpatrick; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6842) granting a pension to Frances E. Gibbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6843) granting a pension to Christina Kraft; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6844) granting a pension to John William Willbrandt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6845) granting a pension to J. Frank Corman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6846) granting a pension to Rachel Pearson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6847) for the relief of George P. Thomas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6848) for the relief of Henry Mersch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6849) for the relief of George W. Morgan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6850) for the relief of Eli Parks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6851) for the relief of John Blackston; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6852) for the relief of Levant C. Dingman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6853) for the relief of John Ziegler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6854) for the relief of Joseph Rutter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6855) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Warrenton, Mo.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6856) for the relief of the treasurer of State Hospital No. 1, at Fulton, Mo.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6857) for the relief of the legal representatives of Alexander Andrae, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6858) to reimburse Marion Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6859) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of John H. Frick; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6860) to correct the military record of Philip Sappington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 6861) granting a pension to George P. Cross; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COVINGTON: A bill (H. R. 6862) granting a pension to Mary P. Haddaway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6863) for the relief of the estate of Capt. Thomas E. Boone, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6864) to equalize the pension of Edwin D. Bates from March, 1883, up to the time of the special act granting him \$24 per month; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6865) granting an increase of pension to Lucien E. Payne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6866) for the relief of John A. Trowbridge; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6867) for the relief of the estate of Larkin H. Penny, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6868) for the relief of Henry C. Emmerke; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 6869) granting an increase of pension to John Bonhome; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6870) granting an increase of pension to Riley Liston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6871) granting a pension to Lewis N. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6872) granting an increase of pension to David E. Garey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 6873) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Webster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6874) for the relief of Everett H. Corson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6875) granting an increase of pension to James Skelley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUPRE: A bill (H. R. 6876) for the relief of the estate of John Pemberton, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6877) for the relief of the estate of Philip Felix Herwig, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.



By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 6878) granting an increase of pension to Edward P. Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6879) granting a pension to Henry Briggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 6880) granting an increase of pension to James A. Darrin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6881) granting an increase of pension to Dustin W. Whitney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6882) granting an increase of pension to Lyman J. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6883) granting an increase of pension to William Borst, alias William Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6884) granting an increase of pension to James H. Parks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6885) granting an increase of pension to Edward G. Waring; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6886) granting an increase of pension to William C. Oakley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6887) granting an increase of pension to Charles N. Merrill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6888) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Van Horne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6889) granting an increase of pension to Charles Holmes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6890) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6891) granting an increase of pension to John Pogue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6892) granting an increase of pension to John J. De Groff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6893) granting an increase of pension to Lot Smalley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6894) granting an increase of pension to Alner Munson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6895) granting an increase of pension to Delos Slits; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6896) granting an increase of pension to Manfield Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6897) granting an increase of pension to David Parris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6898) granting an increase of pension to Richmond White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6899) granting an increase of pension to J. Delos Pruyn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6900) granting an increase of pension to William H. Maxfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6901) granting an increase of pension to John C. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6902) granting an increase of pension to George C. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6903) to correct the military record of Augustus York; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FAISON: A bill (H. R. 6904) for the relief of the estate of Benjamin C. Smith, deceased, W. W. Smith, administrator; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6905) for the relief of the estate of Seth Waters; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6906) for the relief of Samuel J. White; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6907) for the relief of the estate of Thomas S. Howard, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6908) for the relief of W. T. Hawkins; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 6909) granting an increase of pension to Levi H. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6910) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo F. Stalker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6911) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 6912) for the relief of Lewis Myshrahl; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6913) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Morrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 6914) for the relief of the estate of J. M. Fortinberry, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6915) for the relief of the estate of Capt. John Bolino; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6916) for the relief of the estate of Harris Barnes, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 6917) for the relief of Frederick Hughson; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 6918) for the relief of Thomas Cassidy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 6919) granting an increase of pension to Sherwood C. Bowers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6920) for the relief of Thomas Johnson or his legal representatives; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6921) for the relief of David R. Mister; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6922) for the relief of the heirs of Lemmis J. Spence, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 6923) for the relief of Edward S. Salomon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6924) authorizing the President to appoint Alexander Shiras Gassaway a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 6925) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6926) granting an increase of pension to William McClain; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6927) granting an increase of pension to Theodore T. Sperling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6928) granting an increase of pension to George Mudgett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6929) granting an increase of pension to William L. Hands; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6930) granting an increase of pension to Stalaker Marteney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6931) granting a pension to William W. Maroney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 6932) granting an increase of pension to William P. Mayles; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 6933) granting an increase of pension to Charles Wibert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6934) granting an increase of pension to Allen O. Underhill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NYE: A bill (H. R. 6935) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor Stahler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6936) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6937) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Roswell W. Gould; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 6938) for the relief of Nathan P. Randall; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6939) granting an increase of pension to Martin Larvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 6940) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Staples; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTEN of New York (by request): A bill (H. R. 6941) for the relief of the heirs at law of Addison C. Fletcher, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 6942) granting an increase of pension to James M. Newland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6943) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Knoop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6944) granting a pension to George R. Pensyl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PROUTY: A bill (H. R. 6945) granting an increase of pension to David W. Dalrymple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PUJO: A bill (H. R. 6946) for the correction of the military record of Zephaniah Squires; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 6947) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint Robert H. Peck a captain in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 6948) to restore to the active list of the Marine Corps the name of Albert Hamilton; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 6949) granting an increase of pension to James R. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6950) granting an increase of pension to Aaron M. McCown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6951) granting an increase of pension to William R. McNew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6952) granting an increase of pension to John Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6953) granting an increase of pension to James R. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6954) granting an increase of pension to Alexander R. Blazer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6955) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Laughters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6956) granting an increase of pension to James White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6957) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Sellers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6958) granting an increase of pension to P. A. Cobb; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6959) granting an increase of pension to John Dunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6960) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Fitzgerald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6961) granting an increase of pension to Creed Owens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6962) granting an increase of pension to W. B. C. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6963) granting an increase of pension to J. F. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6964) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6965) granting an increase of pension to Sarah McQueen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6966) granting an increase of pension to William J. Ingle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6967) granting an increase of pension to John J. Proffitt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6968) granting an increase of pension to Edgar H. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6969) granting an increase of pension to Henry Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6970) granting an increase of pension to Reuben Cornett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6971) granting a pension to Ed. G. Beal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6972) granting a pension to Bascom M. Meyers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6973) granting a pension to Elizabeth Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6974) granting a pension to Richard Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6975) granting a pension to Nancy West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6976) granting a pension to James K. Bowman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6977) granting a pension to Tide Owens; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6978) granting a pension to Elizabeth L. Bayless; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6979) granting a pension to Daniel P. Hensley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6980) granting a pension to Manley W. Capps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6981) granting a pension to William H. Hart; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6982) granting a pension to John Ward; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6983) granting a pension to Monroe Trent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6984) granting a pension to Thomas R. Trent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6985) granting a pension to John R. P. Thomas; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6986) granting a pension to Absalom L. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6987) granting a pension to Lemiel A. Ragan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6988) granting a pension to Isaac A. Wampler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6989) granting a pension to Aaron W. Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6990) granting a pension to Ada Hurst; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6991) granting a pension to Joseph Case; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6992) granting a pension to Charles A. Bible; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6993) for the relief of James B. Leedy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6994) for the relief of Willis M. Kent; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6995) for the relief of William Vance; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6996) to correct the military record of Thomas Earls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6997) to correct the military record of William B. Jenkins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6998) to correct the military record of W. G. McKinzie; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6999) to correct the military record of Thomas Ownby; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7000) to correct the military record of Isaac G. Osborn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7001) to correct the military record of George Bragg; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7002) to remove the charge of desertion against T. N. McKinnis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7003) to remove the charge of desertion against Andrew Potter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7004) for relief of the heirs of William M. Piper; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7005) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of William Raines; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7006) granting a pension to certain east Tennesseans engaged in the Secret Service of the United States during the War of the Rebellion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 7007) for the relief of Mrs. James M. Jett; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SPEER: A bill (H. R. 7008) making an appropriation for defraying losses sustained by lumbermen on the Allegheny River, Allegheny County, Pa., caused by the erection of a dam on said river in said county; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: A bill (H. R. 7009) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Benson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 7010) granting an increase of pension to Richard S. Higgins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7011) granting an increase of pension to John W. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7012) granting an increase of pension to Perry Morey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7013) granting an increase of pension to Austin P. Thayer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7014) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Collier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7015) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Byers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7016) for the relief of James B. Jewett; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 7017) for the relief of James R. Evans; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 7018) granting an increase of pension to Edward A. Bushnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 7019) granting a pension to Laura Boysen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 7020) granting an increase of pension to James Henderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 7021) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Woodruff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7022) granting an increase of pension to Edward Prentice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7023) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolutions of Palmer Local Union, Palmer Falls, N. Y., and Thomson Local Union, No. 153, International Paper Makers, of Schuylerville, N. Y., in opposition to the proposed Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.



By Mr. BERGER: Petition of 63,285 individuals, and by officials of organizations comprising 24,315 members (the individual signatures are of citizens of every State and Territory, except Alaska and Delaware), requesting the recall of the American Army from the Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Papers accompanying bill to correct the record of the discharge of Jerome L. Brown; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURLESON: Resolutions, petitions, letters, etc., from various organizations throughout the country, protesting against the 10-cent tax on colored oleomargarine and asking Congress to repeal it; also asking Congress to investigate and endeavor to check spread of disease carried through dairy products, especially to prevent tuberculosis: Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, Local Union No. 126, Joplin, Mo.; Richmond Typographical Union, No. 90, Charles J. Hughes, sr., secretary-treasurer, 614 Spring Street, Richmond, Va.; Branch No. 14, Glass Bottle Blowers' Association of the United States and Canada, F. W. W. Brennan, secretary, 38 Penn Street, Woodbury, N. J.; Federation of Women's Clubs, Mrs. C. D. G. Granger, chairman of Industrial Conditions of Women and Children, Atlanta, Ga.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Mayflower Lodge, No. 547, Des Moines, Iowa; District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, Miss Frances Graham French, the Cumberland Apartment, Washington, D. C.; The Woman's Club of Sykeston, N. Dak.; Division No. 154, Order of Railway Conductors, F. E. Tewksbury, secretary and treasurer, Binghamton, N. Y.; Switchmen's Union of North America, Lodge No. 38, M. A. Gooley, 212 Holland Street, Erie, Pa.; Fortnightly Club, Oconomowoc, Wis., Mrs. Celestia L. Edwards, president, Mrs. Charles Cottrell, secretary; Carpenters' District Council, T. F. Kearney, secretary-agent, Room 23, 96 Mathewson Street, Providence, R. I.; Woman's Club, Mrs. Mary J. Ward, corresponding secretary, Charlotte, Mich.; Building Trades' Department, American Federation of Labor, William J. Spencer, secretary-treasurer, Washington, D. C.; Branch 106, Glass Bottle Blowers' Association of the United States and Canada, Columbus, Ohio; Quakesup Club, Mrs. Hattie A. French, president, and Mrs. Gertrude Sanders, secretary, Hot Springs, Ark.; National Expeller Cotton Seed Crushers' Association, D. G. Dumas, secretary, Fort Worth, Tex.; Journeymen Stonecutters' Association of North America, John Rankin, secretary, 2175 East Thirty-ninth Street, Cleveland, Ohio; International Union of Steam Engineers, Local No. 66, E. B. Schenck, recording secretary, 911 Clarissa Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Cigarmakers' International Union of America, Local No. 457, Amos D. Hill, secretary, 808 Michigan Avenue, St. Joseph, Mich.; Musicians' Protective Union, Local No. 161, C. P. Huestis, recording secretary, 421 B Street NE., Washington, D. C.; Menominee-Marquette Shingle Weavers' Union, Local No. 1, Marinette, Wis., James J. Williams, secretary; Woman's Club of Monroe, Wis., Mrs. Jessie Weirich, president, Mrs. Mary L. Lucksinger, acting secretary; Kansas Equal Suffrage Association, Mrs. Catherine Hoffman, president, Enterprise, Kans.; Travel Class of Albert Lea, Mrs. George H. Mueller, corresponding secretary, Albert Lea, Minn.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CALDER: Resolutions of Local No. 158, Schuylerville, N. Y., and Local No. 7, Palmer, N. Y., International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of St. Louis Stereotypers Union, No. 8, city of St. Louis, Mo., favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolutions of Local No. 158, Schuylerville, N. Y., and Local No. 7, Palmer, N. Y., International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARNES: Resolution of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, against present tariff rates on steel cotton ties and bagging; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: Petition of the employees of the Eastern Tale Co., operating in the State of Vermont, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Levi H. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of George C. Edwards, of Bridgeport, Conn., favoring the Canadian reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of N. J. Batchelder, master of National Grange, Cleveland; master of Union Grange; and Clift & Goodrich, of

New York, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany bill for the relief of Alonzo F. Stalker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Pratts Patent (Ltd.), in opposition to House bill 4413, relative to foods for domestic animals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Petition of 125 residents of Haverhill and Bradford, Mass., favoring a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: Resolution of Aroostook County Pomona Grange, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of F. W. Heidel, of Fargo, N. Dak., against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Grafton, N. Dak., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of residents of Niagara, N. Dak., favoring the increase in salary to rural free-delivery carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HIGGINS: Petition of citizens of Naugatuck, Conn., against arbitration treaty with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: Papers to accompany bill authorizing the President to appoint Alexander Shiras Gassaway a second assistant engineer in the United States Revenue-Cutter Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of South Branch Grange, South Branch, Mich., protesting against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Rev. Charles E. Marvin and 30 other residents of Bay City, Mich., favoring the passage of House bill 383; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. NYE: Resolutions of Minnesota Millers' Club, Minneapolis, Minn., favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Robert P. Brown, of Providence, R. I., favoring H. R. 26541, relative to trusts and combinations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of Grand Army of the Republic, Providence, R. I., favoring building additional battleships; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. POST: Resolutions of Irish-American and German-American societies of New York, against closer relations with Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Joint resolution 16 of California Legislature, relating to Deadmans Island; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of William P. McHaffie, of San Francisco, Cal., against the Canadian reciprocity treaty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Legislature of State of California, favoring parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Knight & Lyle and others, of Dunsmuir, Cal., against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the L. B. Tibbetts Chapter of American Women's League, composed of 60 members, against suppressing magazines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of William Simpson and others, of California, against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Mrs. A. I. Strawn, of Corning, Cal., against raising the postal rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Petition of citizens of the seventh district of Massachusetts, protesting against the establishment of a national board of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, resolutions of New England Shoe Wholesalers' Association, of Boston, in opposition to the proposal to place leather and boots and shoes on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, asking that all bagging and ties used in the baling of cotton be placed upon the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULZER: Petitions of Local No. 158, Thomsons, N. Y., and of Local No. 7, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, of Palmer, N. Y., against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of tea importers of the city of New York, relative to the duty on tea; to the Committee on Ways and Means. Also, resolutions of Merchants' Association of New York favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTTER: Petition of sundry citizens of Rhode Island, favoring the establishment of a department of public health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, resolutions of the Carpenters' District Council of Providence, R. I., and vicinity, favoring repeal of the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

## SENATE.

MONDAY, April 24, 1911.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

### NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Assistant Secretary read the following:

OFFICE OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
UNITED STATES SENATE,  
April 24, 1911.

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH, Senator from Michigan, to perform the duties of the Chair.

WM. P. FRYE,  
President pro Tempore.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer, and directed that the Journal of the last legislative day should be read.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

### SENATORS FROM IOWA AND FLORIDA.

Mr. CUMMINS. I present the certificate of election of WILLIAM S. KENYON as Senator from Iowa for the unexpired term of my late colleague, Jonathan P. Dolliver, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the credentials.

The credentials of WILLIAM S. KENYON, chosen by the Legislature of the State of Iowa a Senator from that State to fill the vacancy in the term ending March 4, 1913, caused by the death of Jonathan P. Dolliver, were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. FLETCHER. I present the certificate of election of my colleague, Mr. NATHAN P. BRYAN, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the credentials.

The credentials of NATHAN P. BRYAN, chosen by the Legislature of the State of Florida a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1911, were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. KENYON is present, and I ask that the oath of his office be now administered to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator elect from Iowa will present himself at the Vice President's desk and the oath will be administered to him.

Mr. FLETCHER. I make the same statement with reference to my colleague [Mr. BRYAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator elect from Florida will present himself at the Vice President's desk.

Mr. KENYON and Mr. BRYAN were escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. CUMMINS and Mr. FLETCHER, respectively, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to them by the Presiding Officer.

### DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Auditor of the Treasury Department relative to the destruction of certain papers on the files of the department which are not needed in the transaction of public business and have no permanent value or historical interest. (H. Doc. No. 24.)

The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments. The Chair appoints as the committee on the part of the Senate the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives of the appointment of the committee on the part of the Senate.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER presented a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the enactment of legislation placing appointments and promotions in the Consular Service upon a merit basis, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of the northwest section of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against any further action being taken in the case of the election of a Senator from Illinois, which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Robert Emmet Memorial Association, of Buffalo, N. Y., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Church of the Brethren of Pasadena, Cal., and a petition of the Union Sunday School, of Neutral, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation for the suppression of the opium evil, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of Local Grange No. 286, Patrons of Husbandry, of Hillsdale County, Mich., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Brace, Tenn., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of Local Union No. 249, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, of Villa Ridge, Ill., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GALLINGER presented memorials of 98 citizens of Franklin and Berlin, in the State of New Hampshire, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Takoma Park Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia, praying for the adoption of a universal transfer system for the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. LODGE. I present a letter in the nature of a petition, signed by the president of the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, of Boston, Mass. The letter is short. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS  
BOOT AND SHOE WORKERS' UNION,  
Boston, Mass., April 22, 1911.

Hon. HENRY CAROT LODGE,  
1765 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Speaking for the shoe workers who are employed in the principal industry of New England, I venture to solicit your vote and influence against any tariff legislation which would put finished leather and shoes on the free list.

The greater efficiency of labor in the shoe industry in the United States, as against any foreign country, is not sufficient to offset the lower standard of living in all foreign countries, as compared with the United States, notwithstanding the cheaper labor prices which prevail in foreign countries. To put shoes and finished leather on the free list or to in any way reduce the present tariff would compel American shoe manufacturers to meet foreign competition through the only avenue open to them, namely, to attack the wages of the shoe workers and thereby bring about a standard of wages lower than at present exists, which would result in industrial warfare and no doubt eventually establish the lower standard of wages, consequently the lower standard of living.

We therefore trust that your vote and influence will be directed against any legislation which will reduce the tariff on shoes. The shoe workers who would be directly and adversely affected by a reduction of the tariff on shoes number at a very conservative estimate 150,000, who, with those dependent upon them, would make at least three-quarters of a million people who are directly concerned.

We will be glad to have your views upon this question.

Respectfully, yours,

JOHN F. TOBIN, General President.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of Gaspee Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Providence, R. I., praying for the ratification of the treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.